

THE
CHURCH REVIEW.

No. III.

OCTOBER, 1848.

"KENRICK ON THE PRIMACY."

ART. I.—*The Primacy of the Apostolical See Vindicated.* By FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. *Ipsa est petra quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ. Augustinus in Ps. contra partem Donati.* Third edition. New York: Edward Dunigan and Brother, 1848. pp. 527. 8vo.

IN our preceding number we placed at the head of our first Article, the title of this book as it appeared in 1845. The third edition was then only announced. It has since appeared, and has again been advertised by the publishers in the Churchman, even in a bolder tone. We have already disclaimed any belief that the Editor or the proprietors of the Churchman had any agency in this matter. The fact is, that our religious newspapers, as they are called, have been too careless on this point, and have too generally admitted advertisements of sectarian works. Our own booksellers, as a mere matter of trade, have bought and sold such works; and for the purpose of patronizing our newspapers, have inserted and paid for advertisements in them which, in our estimation, are hardly consistent with the obligation "to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." With these remarks, we proceed, as we promised, to consider the testimony of the Church with regard to the Roman Primacy down to the fourth General Council, or the middle of the fifth century. We shall show, as we trust, that the idea of any primacy at

all grew out of political considerations, and the Union of Church and State.

The rise and fall of Empires is the most awful and portentous sign of God's sovereignty. The fate of Rome in particular, the fourth great empire of the world, is more especially interesting to the thoughtful Christian, because its elevation and decline is so intimately connected with the fulfillment of prophecy, and the prosperous and calamitous condition of the Church.

Not quite seven centuries and a half before the incarnation of the world's REDEEMER, two brothers of a royal race, but associated with outlaws of abandoned and ferocious character, began to lay the foundation of Rome. Its whole territory was less than eighteen miles square, inferior even to the insignificant Duchy of Modena: nor, with the exception of the Sabine coalition, were its limits extended for more than two and a half centuries. The war with the Tarquins and their allies, after it became a Republic, increased its dominions in Italy; but it was not until the first Punic war that it stepped over the straits of Messina, and by means of a rudely constructed and inconsiderable navy, first landed on the shores of Africa. After the final conquest of Carthage, which did not take place until six centuries of its existence had rolled away, its power began to increase, like the wealth of the Usurer, with almost incredible rapidity. As the time approached for the incarnation of CHRIST, it seemed as if the whole civilized world, panic struck by its terrible power, or fascinated by its dreadful brilliancy, rushed into its open and voracious jaws, and by rapid deglutition, was converted into its unwieldy and enormous members. Rome, in her proud language of "*Urbis et Orbis*," became a synonyme for the habitable world; and in the ordinary course of human events, her hundred and twenty provinces were consolidated into one universal Empire, under the unlimited sway of a single man in the person of Augustus Cæsar.

Such was the rise of Rome. Augustus affected, during the whole of his long reign, to hold his sovereignty by decennial periods, at the will of the Senate and Roman people. Pretending to relieve them from trouble, he placed all the nearer and more quiet provinces, nominally under their sway, reserving to himself exclusively, the more distant and more turbulent. In the latter, he quartered the flower of the Roman legions, and thus reduced the army under his sole and irresponsible dominion. According to this division, the Roman officers who governed the several provinces were

known by various Latin titles. The provinces dependent on the Senate were called Proconsulares, Consulares and Prætoriaræ, according as they were ruled by Proconsuls, Consuls or Prætors. Of those governed by Augustus, the smaller had over them Præsides, and were termed Præsidiales, while the larger were subjected to the Legati Cæsaris, Præfecti Augustales, or Legati Proprætores; whence they were called Proprætoriaræ, Legatoriaræ, Augustales, Consulares. At times, extraordinary officers were appointed under the names of Proconsules extraordinarii, Tutores, Quæstores and Procuratores. Sometimes, however, the Procurator was the same as Præsides. These we have said were Latin titles; but in Greek, as there was but one principal generic title for the provinces, (ἐπαρχίας,) so was there but that of *Eparch* applied indiscriminately to all governors of provinces. Such appears to have been the state of the provinces till the time of Hadrian the successor of Trajan. There were other divisions into Kingdoms, Provinces and Free Cities, concerning which it is unnecessary here to speak, unless it be to remark that the free cities were those which, by the consent of the Roman people, continued to be governed by their own magistrates and laws; some by the terms of their original submission, others by grant, and others by purchase. Those colonies which bore the wolf as their emblem, were governed by Roman laws and had the privileges of Latin citizens. To many of these was granted the honor of being *Metropolitan*, or of having equal rank with the chief cities of the several provinces, and of being *Autocephalæ* or independent of their jurisdiction. Hence there were often several metropolitan cities in the same province, distinguished as first, second, third, &c., the dignity of Primate being applied to the first. (*Frid. Spanhemii Geog. Sac. et Ecclesiast. Distrib. Rom. Imp. ante temp. Constant. M.*)

In the time of Hadrian some changes appear to have taken place, but what they were is doubtful. Spanheim supposes that the Captains of the Guards, called Præfecti-prætorio, at that time two in number, were advanced to be next in dignity to the Emperor. (*Spanhemii Geog. Sac. et Eccles. ut sup.*) Certain it is, that these military chieftains acquired, by means of their soldiery, a power which was often fatal to their masters. This power, weakened by Diocletian, was finally subdued and regulated by Constantine. The division of the Empire into the Eastern and Western, first proposed under Antoninus and Geta, did not take place till the time of Diocletian. But under Constantine, it was again united; and in the new arrangement which then took place, he appointed *four* instead

of two, Præfecti-prætorio, to whom he submitted the administration of the Provinces. Zosimus, to whom we are indebted for this information, enumerates those of each division. (*Zosim. Hist. Lib. ii. cc. 32, 33.*) As it coincides exactly with the most ancient Notitiæ Imperii now extant, of which we shall presently give an account, it is unnecessary to transcribe it here. The coincidence shows that no great change took place from the renewed union under Constantine till the final division of the Empire under Arcadius and Honorius. For although the transfer of the seat of dominion to Constantinople took place in A. D. 330, and after the death of Constantine his power was divided among his sons, yet the form of the four præfectures was constantly retained.

The Notitiæ to which we allude is that which goes by the name of the Synecdemus of Hierocles the Grammarian. It is defective, and we have attempted from other sources to supply the deficiency. It must have been written between the final division of the empire under Arcadius and Honorius, A. D. 395, and the promulgation of the Theodosian Code, A. D. 438; probably as Gibbon thinks, before A. D. 407. It enumerates one hundred and eighteen Provinces, divided into thirteen Dioceses, under the four Præfecti-prætorio. It also states the names, number and order of the cities in each province; but as the enumeration of these would far exceed our limits, we shall give only what we think important to be known by our readers, by inserting the name of the first, or Metropolitan city. This, be it carefully observed, is the civil arrangement of the Empire introduced by Constantine the Great. The arrangement of the several provinces existed substantially in the time of Augustus, though some few were subdivided afterwards.

I. PRÆFECTUS-PRÆTORIO ORIENTALIS,

Having under him Five Dioceses and Forty-Nine Provinces.

I. ORIENTAL DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. <i>Palestina prima.</i>	<i>Cæsarea.</i>	8. <i>Palestina</i> }	<i>Jerusalem</i> or
2. <i>Phœnice.</i>	<i>Tyrus.</i>	<i>salutaris.</i> }	<i>Ælia.</i>
3. <i>Syria.</i>	<i>Antiochia.</i>	9. <i>Palestina secunda.</i>	<i>Scythopolis.</i>
4. <i>Cilicia prima.</i>	<i>Tarsus.</i>	10. <i>Phœnice Libani.</i>	<i>Emissa.</i>
5. <i>Cyprus.</i>	<i>Constantia, or</i>	11. <i>Euphratensis.</i>	<i>Hieropolis.</i>
	<i>Salamis.</i>	12. <i>Syria Salutaris.</i>	<i>Apamea.</i>
6. <i>Arabia.</i>	<i>Bostra.</i>	13. <i>Osrhoëna.</i>	<i>Edessa.</i>
7. <i>Isauria.</i>	<i>Seleucia.</i>	14. <i>Mesopotamia.</i>	<i>Amida.</i>
		15. <i>Cilicia Secunda.</i>	<i>Anazarbus.</i>

II. EGYPTIAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Lybia Superior.	Ptolemais.	4. Aegyptus.	Alexandria.
2. Lybia Inferior.	Dranicon.	5. Arcadia.	Oxirinchus.
3. Thebais.	Antinoë, or Lycopolis.	6. Augustamnica.	Pelusium.

III. ASIATIC DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. <i>Asia Proconsularis.</i>	<i>Ephesus.</i>	7. Phrygia Pacatiana.	<i>Laodicea.</i>
2. Pamphylia.	<i>Perga.</i>	8. Phrygia Salutaris.	Synada.
3. Hellespontus.	Cyzicus.	9. Lycia.	<i>Myra.</i>
4. Lydia.	<i>Sardis.</i>	10. Caria.	Amphrodisias, or Stauropolis.
5. Pisidia.	<i>Antiochia.</i>	11. Insulæ Cyclades.	Rhodus.
6. Lycæonia.	<i>Iconium.</i>		

IV. PONTIC DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Galatia.	Ancyra.	7. Hellenopontus.	Amasea.
2. Bithynia.	Nicomedia.	8. Armenia prima.	Sebastia.
3. Honorias.	Claudiopolis.	9. Armenia secunda.	Melitene.
4. Cappadocia prima.	Cæsarea.	10. Galatia Salutaris.	Pessinus.
5. Paphlagonia.	Gangra.	11. Cappadocia se- cunda.	Tyana.
6. Pontus Polemo- niacus.	Neo-Cæsarea.		

V. THRACIAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Europa.	Heraclea.	4. Rhodope.	Trajanopolis.
2. Thracia.	Philippopolis.	5. Mæsia secunda.	Mercianopolis.
3. Hæmimontis.	Adrianopolis.	6. Scythia.	Tomi.

II. PRÆFECTUS-PRÆTORIO ILLYRICI,

Having under him Two Dioceses and Eleven Provinces.

I. MACEDONIAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. <i>Achaia Proconsularis.</i>	<i>Corinthus.</i>	5. Epirus Vetus.	<i>Nicopolis.</i>
2. Macedonia.	<i>Thessalonica.</i>	6. Epirus Nova et Pars Macedo- niæ Salutaris.	Dyrrachium.
3. Creta.	Gortyna.		
4. Thessalia.	Larissa.		

II. DACIAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Dacia Mediterranea.	Sardica.	5. Pars Macedoniæ	Scodra,
2. Dacia Ripensis.	Rhazaria.	Salutaris et	or
3. Mæsia prima.	Viminacin.	Prævalitana.	Doracion.
4. Dardania.	Scupon.		

III. PRÆFECTUS-PRÆTORIO ITALIÆ,

Having under him Three Dioceses and Twenty-Nine Provinces.

I. ITALIC DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Venetiæ.	Aquileia.	8. Sicilia.	<i>Syracusa.</i>
2. Aemilia.	Ravenna.	9. Apulia et Calabria.	
3. Liguria.	Mediolanum.	10. Lucania et Brutii.	
4. Flaminia Pice- num Annona- rium.		11. Alpes Cottiae.	
5. Tuscia et Umbria.		12. Rætia prima.	
6. Picenum Subur- bicularium.		13. Rætia secunda.	
7. Campania.		14. Samnium.	
		15. Valeria.	
		16. Sardinia.	<i>Calaris.</i>
		17. Corsica.	

II. WEST ILLYRIC DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Pannonia secunda.		5. Noricum Medit- erraneum.	
2. Sævia or Salvia.		6. Noricum Ripense.	
3. Dalmatia.			
4. Pannonia prima.			

III. AFRICAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Byzacium.	Adrumetum.	4. Mauritania Cæsa- riensis.	
2. Numidia.		5. Tripolis.	
3. Mauritania Siti- fensis.		6. Africa Procon- sularis.	

IV. PRÆFECTUS-PRÆTORIO GALLIARUM,

Having under him Three Dioceses and Twenty-Nine Provinces.

I. SPANISH DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Bætica.	Hispalis.	6. Tingitania, (Af- rican Coast.)	
2. Lusitania.	Emerita Augusta.	7. Baleares, (now Majorca, Minor- ica and Yvica.)	
3. Gallæcia.	Bracara.		
4. Tarraconensis.	Tarraco.		
5. Carthaginiensis.	{ Carthago His- panica. (Cartagena.)		

II. GALLICAN DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Viennensis.	Arelate, (now Arles.)	5. Belgica prima.	Treveris, (Trèves.)
2. Lugdunensis prima.	Lugdunum, (now Lyons.)	6. Belgica secunda.	Rhemi.
3. Germania prima.	Treviris, after- wards Mogunti- num. Mayence.	7. Alpes Maritimæ.	Ebrodunum.
4. Germania secunda.	Treveris, after- wards Colonia Agrippa. (Co- logne.)	8. Alpes Penninæ et Graiæ.	Vienna, (Vienne.)
		9. Maxima Sequa- norum.	Vesontio, (Besançon.)
		10. Aquitania prima.	Bituriges, (Bourges.)

GALLICAN DIOCESE, (CONTINUED.)

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
11. Aquitania secunda.	Burdigala, (Bordeaux.)	14. Narbonensis secunda.	Aquæ Sextimæ, (Aix en Provence.)
12. Novempopuli.	Elusa sive Augusta Ausciorum.	15. Lugdunensis secunda.	Rothomagus, (Rouen.)
13. Narbonensis prima.	Narbo, (Narbonne.)	16. Lugdunensis tertia.	Turones, (Tours)
		17. Lugdunensis Senonia.	Senonæ, (Sens.)

III. BRITISH DIOCESE.

PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.	PROVINCES.	METROPOLES.
1. Maximæ Cæsariensis.	Eboracum, (York.)	4. Britannia secunda, all beyond Severn.	
2. Valentia, beyond the Picts Wall.		5. Flavia Cæsariensis, from the Thames to the Humber.	
3. Britannia prima, all south of the Thames.	Londinuni, (London.)		

According to this arrangement, the thirteen Dioceses, divided, as we have seen, under the four Præfecti-prætorio, were governed each by its own Vicarius or Comes, or to use the Greek phraseology, its *Exarch*. Subordinate to him were the several rulers of the provinces, bearing the various titles originally established in the time of Augustus. Each province again was divided into cities, having jurisdiction over the villages within their respective territorial bounds. Each of these cities with its dependencies, was called a *παροικία*, parœcia or parochia. But our readers must be careful not to confound the *Parochia* of the Greeks with the word *Parish*, as that term is now used. The modern signification of *Diocese* and *Parish*, is entirely of Latin origin, as might easily be shown if our limits would permit. It must here be remarked that both the capitals of the Empire were exempt from this general arrangement, being placed under a special Præfectus urbi, with a region of country under his dominion called the Regio Suburbicaria. That of Rome extended to the hundredth mile-stone. (See the *Notitia Dignitatum*, in Godefroy's *Ed. of the Theodos. Code* Tom., vi. P. ii, pp. 10, 11.)

Having thus given a view of the changes which took place in the administration of the Empire, we are prepared to examine whether any corresponding changes took place in the Church. That its external arrangement was influenced by the political divisions of the Roman Empire, is so fully admitted by Spanheim, Salmasius, and other learned Presbyterians, as well as by the writers of the Roman communion, that it may well be considered as beyond the limits of con-

troversy. Indeed no one can examine the Apostolical writings and history, with a map of the several provinces before him, without being struck by the fact that the Apostles invariably went to the metropolis of each province, for the purpose of first planting there the seeds of the Gospel. To make this the more perceptible to our readers, we have in the preceding list of provinces and metropolitan cities, marked those in Italics which are mentioned in the New Testament; and so conclusive is the analogy where the provinces are named and not the cities, or vice versâ, as to make the inference almost certain that the metropolis of the province was also the first Christian See.

As from the reign of Augustus to that of Hadrian, each province, (Gr. *ἐπαρχία*, see Acts xxiii. 34, xxv. 1,) was governed by its own magistrate, dependent immediately on the Emperor or Senate, without appeal to any intermediate power, so the Church in each province appears to have been governed by the councils of its Bishops, without appeal to any earthly superior. The learned Thomassin, though a strenuous supporter of papal authority, is obliged to admit that till the time of the Council of Nice, all Ecclesiastical affairs were decided in the council of each province.* The circumstances to which he refers, occurred after the period of which we are now speaking.

The Metropolitan City was, as its name imports, the Mother City, and it became also the Mother Church of the province. Thus Antioch was the chief seat of the Christian religion in Syria, Jerusalem in Palæstina Salutaris, Cæsarea in Palæstina prima, Perga in Pamphylia, Sardis in Lydia, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium in Lycaonia, Laodicea in Phrygia, Corinth in Achaia, [see 2 Cor. i. 1, and ix. 2.] Thessalonica in Macedonia, [see 1 Thess. i. 7, 8]; and so of other regions in which the Apostles labored. This explains why Timothy was sent to Ephesus as the chief city of proconsular Asia, and why it became, as the early Christian writers testify, the last residence of the Apostle John, being the most important city in the whole region of Asia Minor. The analogy is so perfect, as we have said, that when a province is mentioned, we may safely infer that the first Church was planted in its capital

* *Thomassin de l'ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise.* Vol. i, p. 20.—"Il faut sçavoir," he observes, "que jusqu'au Concile de Nicée toutes les affaires Ecclesiastiques, s'étoient terminées dans les conciles de chaque province; et il n'y avoit eu que très-peu de rencontres où il eût été nécessaire de convoquer une assemblée de plusieurs provinces. Le Concile de Nicée même ne parle que des Conciles Provinciaux, et veut que toutes choses s'y résolvent."

city, though the fact is not expressly asserted. When Titus, for example, was left in Crete to set in order the things which were wanting, his place of residence was doubtless *Gortyna*. When St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, we perceive why the plural word "Churches" is used; for we make no question that Churches had been formed in both the Metropoles *Ancyra* and *Pessinus*. The Epistle to the Colossians, written by St. Paul, on the special occasion of their having sent a supply for his necessities while he was a prisoner at Rome, he directed to be read in the Church of *Laodicea*; for that was the capital city of Phrygia Pacatiana, in which *Colosse* was situated. He speaks also of the Christians in *Hierapolis* (Col. iv. 13.) because that city was then in the same province with *Colosse* and *Laodicea*. According to Malala, the division of Phrygia into two provinces was made by Constantine; and hence Hierocles mentions Hierapolis after Synnada, as the second city of Phrygia Salutaris. These remarks are sufficient to show the system by which the Church was propagated during the Apostolic age; and when St. Paul speaks of fully preaching the gospel of Christ "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum;" of "having no more place in these parts;" and even of the Gospel being preached "to every creature which is under heaven;" [comp. Rom. xv. 19, 23, with Col. i. 6—24,] we understand it of the extension of the Church into every province of the Roman Empire; and we gather assuredly that enough was done in each province, to carry on the work within its own special organization.

Churches, therefore, being thus formed in the chief cities of the several provinces, the Bishops there established were left to continue the work of Evangelists in the various cities with their several territories into which the province was subdivided.* Whether the Bishop of the Metropolis had originally any jurisdiction over the Bishops of other cities, or whether such jurisdiction followed the subsequent changes introduced into the civil government of the Roman Empire, is a question which has excited some difference of opinion among learned Protestants as well as Romanists. From what we

* This is Tertullian's account of the manner in which the Apostles fulfilled their Mission. *De præscr. Hæreticorum*, Cap. 20. Ed. Semler. Vol. 2, p. 23.—"Apostoli — primo per Judæam contestata fide in Jesum Christum, ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti: eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgarunt. Et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt; a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ; cæteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatae sunt, et quotidie mutantur ut ecclesiæ fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsæ Apostolicæ deputabuntur ut soboles Apostolicarum ecclesiarum."

know of human nature it is evident that much deference would be paid to the Mother Church; and whenever the Bishops were assembled in Council, that the Bishop of the Metropolitan Church would be naturally called upon to preside. But this is what the Canonists call τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς, the precedence of honor, not τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς ἐξουσίας, the precedence of power. Certain it is, as Le Quien admits, that during the first three centuries, the simple name of Bishop, without any additional title of honor, was given to the greatest and most eminent, as well as the least and most obscure. They were not even called Metropolitans or Primate; and the name of Archbishop was first given in Egypt, and as far as we can trace its earliest use, to the Bishop of Alexandria, in the fourth century. It was usual in the provinces of Western Africa, Carthage alone excepted, for the senior Bishop to preside in their Councils; but Tertullian, a presbyter of Carthage, objected to the term Summus Pontifex, or chief Bishop, as did Cyprian to that of Bishop of Bishops. [*Oriens Christianus*, vol. i, pp. 5, 6, sect. ix—xi.] We may fairly conclude, then, that during the first period we have mentioned, that is, until the reign of Hadrian, and even some time beyond it, there was no other difference of rank among the Bishops than that which arose from respect to the Mother Church, from seniority of age, or from personal weight of character.

The question, we have already observed, is obscure, whether any change was wrought in the civil administration of the Empire under Hadrian. If there was such a change, it may account for an increased authority given subsequently to the Bishops of the metropolitan cities, and also for the formation of Councils in which the Bishops of several provinces were present, and in which, consequently, questions of precedence and rule must take place. The collection of Canons, commonly called Apostolical, which were in fact the Canons of the Greek Church, in the third century, require of the Bishops of each province to acknowledge him who is first among them, to esteem him as their head, and to do nothing of moment without his consent. (*Can.* xxxiii.) But, on the other hand, he is required, for the preservation of concord, to do nothing without the consent (γνώμης) of all the Bishops. These Canons, however, cannot be traced higher than the end of the second or beginning of the third century; [*see Bp. Beveridge Pandect. Can.* vol. 2. *Notes* pp. 26, 27.] and the very phraseology of the Canon in question seems to us to prove that the primacy had been the result of usage, now first converted into a right.

The new arrangement of the Empire by Constantine, was made in A. D. 315; and then probably the word *Diocese* was for the first time employed to denote a large tract of country, consisting of several provinces, and subject to a Vicarius, or Comes, or Exarch, who was, in his turn, subject to one of the four *Præfecti-prætorio*. In A. D. 325, the tenth year of Constantine, the first General Council was assembled by his authority, at Nice, or Nicæa, in the province of Bithynia. The Canons of this Council having relation to the present subject, are from the fourth to the seventh inclusive. The fourth Canon provides, that a Bishop ought to be consecrated by all the Bishops of his province; but, if that be difficult, by three at least, the rest giving their consent in writing, and the ratification of the whole pertaining in each province to the *Metropolitan*.—The fifth Canon renews, with some modifications, the thirty-seventh of the Apostolical Canons, requiring that provincial Councils or Synods, be held twice in each year,—the first before Lent, the second some time in Autumn.—The sixth Canon runs thus: "Let the ancient customs of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, remain in force, so that the Bishop of Alexandria may have authority over them all, since the Bishop of Rome has a similar custom. In like manner also, with regard to Antioch, and in the other provinces, let their privileges (*τὰ πρεσβεία*, rights of primogeniture,) be preserved to the Churches. And in general be it published, that if any one be made a Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Council declares that he ought not to be a Bishop. Nevertheless, if for private ends, or through a spirit of contention, two or three oppose the common suffrage of all, the same being reasonable and canonical, then let the suffrage of the majority prevail." The seventh provides, that since the custom and ancient tradition have prevailed, that the Bishop of Aelia, (Jerusalem) should be honored, let him have the accompaniment of honor, saving the peculiar rank of the *Metropolis*." [*That is Cesarea.*] [*Beveregii Pand. Can. Tom. i, pp. 63—68.*]

In these Canons it is to be observed, that although the term *Metropolitan* is now first employed, no other name but that of *Bishop* is used, even for Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; that the appeal to *ancient custom* as the ground of the authority claimed by the Bishop of Alexandria, shows that *no higher authority than custom* could be pleaded for it; and lastly, that the very obscurity with which allusion is made to the usage at Rome, and to the privileges of Antioch and other provinces, shows the extreme caution with which the Nicene

Fathers were disposed to treat this dangerous subject. We can not help suspecting that the Emperor wished to have the government of the Church so modified as to comport with his own new regulations in the Empire; and that the Fathers, afraid of refusing, and at the same time unwilling so greatly to innovate, expressed themselves with a studied ambiguity. The sixth Canon, though it can not, by any fairness of interpretation, be said to have established the patriarchal government of the Church, certainly prepared the way for it; and, as we shall soon see, was made the occasion of other enactments in subsequent Councils, of a more decided character.—By the seventh Canon, the Council intended to set at rest a controversy which had arisen between the Bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea. After the destruction of Jerusalem, Cæsarea became the ecclesiastical as well as the political Metropolis of the province. Hadrian having rebuilt Jerusalem, and called it Aelia, after his own name, the Bishop of Aelia considered himself as entitled to all the ancient honors of the See of Jerusalem. This claim being opposed by the Bishop of Cæsarea, the Council endeavored to reconcile the parties by a kind of compromise, reserving the rights of the Metropolis for the one, and so far renewing the ancient privileges of the other, as to give him "the accompaniment of honor;" in other words to give him rank next to Cæsarea. That it did not convey to the Bishop of Jerusalem any patriarchal authority, is evident on the very face of the Canon; but we may say of this what has been said of the sixth, that it paved the way for the subsequent assumption of such powers.

In the year of the common æra 329, Constantine transferred the seat of Empire from Rome to Byzantium, a ruined city of Thrace. The foundation of Constantinople was laid on the 26th of November, and proceeded with such rapidity that it was solemnly consecrated as New Rome, on the 11th of May, A. D. 330. Henceforward no pains or expense were spared to make it similar to ancient Rome; and the former seat of Empire became in consequence almost depopulated. Heraclæa, formerly the Metropolis, was now the second city of the province of Europa; but it still continued to hold its rank as the Mother Church, until the year 381, in which the second General Council was held at Constantinople, under Theodosius the Great.

In this Council we see the civil divisions of the great Dioceses established by Constantine, recognized *for the first time* as ecclesiastical divisions. The second Canon provides, that to avoid confusion, the Bishops are not to go beyond the *Dio-*

ceses in which they live ; that the Bishop of Alexandria is to confine himself to the Diocese of Egypt ; that the Bishops of the East are to govern only in the East, preserving the privileges (πρεσβεία) mentioned in the Nicene Canons as belonging to Antioch ; that the Bishops of the Asian, the Pontic, and the Thracian Dioceses are to confine themselves to those Dioceses ; that they shall not consecrate or ordain, or perform other official acts in other Dioceses, except by invitation ; that according to the decrees of Nice, the provinces are to be governed by the provincial Synods ; that in barbarous nations, the Churches are to be governed according to established usage. The third Canon provides that "the Bishop of Constantinople shall have (τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς) the precedence of honor, after the Bishop of Rome, BECAUSE THAT CITY IS NEW ROME."

As yet, no other name but that of Bishop, and no other distinction but that of Metropolitan, had been sanctioned by public authority. The name of *Archbishop* occurs once, indeed, as early as A. D. 325, in a catalogue of Egyptian Bishops given to Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, by Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis. This catalogue is preserved in the Apology of Athanasius, against the Arians ; [*Opera ed. Montf.* Vol. i, p. 188.] and the passage in question runs thus : "John, Bishop of Memphis, commanded by the Emperor to be present *with the Archbishop*." Forty nine years later it is used several times by Epiphanius, but *always* in speaking of the Bishop of Alexandria. The use of this title seems, therefore, to have originated with the Egyptians ; and this inference is strengthened by the fact, that it first occurs in a public document, as the phraseology of the Egyptian Bishops in the first act of the Council of Ephesus, the 22d of June, A. D. 431. Cyril is here called repeatedly the Archbishop of Alexandria, and Celestinus, though less frequently, the Archbishop of Rome. Both, however, are still more generally spoken of by the simple title of Bishop ; an evidence that the change was not yet the established usage.

No act affecting the government of the Church was passed at Ephesus, excepting that which related to the province of Cyprus. A præfect having been sent to that Island by the Duke (δουξ) whom the Emperor had appointed at Antioch, the Bishop of Antioch claimed on that account an ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Bishops of Cyprus. The Council decided against this claim, on the ground of conformity to ancient custom and the Canons of the Holy Fathers, by which each pro-

vince was to enjoy its rights pure and inviolate. The Metropolitan of Cyprus, and not the Bishop of Antioch, was therefore to consecrate Bishops for that Island.

Twenty years later, the fourth general Council was held at Chalcedon; and here, for the first time, the title of Archbishop is given to the Bishop of Constantinople. Various Canons were passed with relation to the government of the Church; but it is necessary to our present purpose to mention of these Canons only the famous twenty-eighth and the thirtieth. On account of their importance we give them without abridgement.

"CANON XXVIII. Following in every respect the decrees of the Holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon just read of the hundred and fifty Bishops," (i. e. the iii. Canon of the second General Council,) "we also decree and enact the same, concerning the privileges (περὶ τῶν προσηλίων) of the holy Church of Constantinople, or New Rome. For the Fathers justly gave privileges (τὰ προσηλία) to the See of Ancient Rome, because that was the Imperial City; and for the same reason the hundred and fifty Bishops awarded equal privileges (προσηλία) to the most holy See of New Rome, rightly judging that a city honored with Empire and a Senate, and enjoying equal privileges with ancient Imperial Rome, should also be as exalted as that in ecclesiastical matters, ranking next to it; so that the Metropolitans only of the Pontic, Asian and Thracian Dioceses, and also the Bishops of the aforesaid Dioceses dwelling among the Barbarians, should be consecrated by the aforesaid most holy See of the most holy Church of Constantinople; each of the Metropolitans of the aforesaid Dioceses consecrating the Bishops of his province as is stated in the sacred Canons; and that the Metropolitans of the aforesaid Dioceses, as has been said, be consecrated by the Archbishop of Constantinople, the votes being given according to custom and communicated to him."

On this Canon Balsamon remarks, that "previous to its enactment, the Bishops of each province consecrated their Metropolitan." This right, then, was now, *for the first time*, taken away from all the provinces contained in the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian Dioceses, and vested in the Archbishop of Constantinople, who was thus constituted their Superior. Here, then, was the first clear and decided enactment of that authority which was afterwards called Patriarchal.

When the Bishops were called upon to subscribe the decrees of the Council, thirteen out of the seventeen Egyptian

Bishops present* evaded giving their signature, on the pretext that they could not do so without the consent of the Bishop of Alexandria; and as the Council had deposed Dioscorus, it was necessary for them to wait till another was elected. That this was merely a pretext, was proved by the subsequent conduct of the whole Egyptian Diocese; but it gave rise to the thirtieth and last Canon of the Council, as follows:

"Whereas, the most Reverend Bishops of Egypt defer for the present subscribing the epistle of the most holy Archbishop Leo, not from hostility to the Catholic faith, but pleading that it is the usage of the Egyptian Diocese to do no such act without the consent and mandate of the Archbishop, and therefore asking indulgence until the consecration of the future Bishop of the great city of Alexandria, therefore, it seems to us just and humane that this indulgence be granted to them, if they remain in person in the Imperial city until the Archbishop of the great city of Alexandria be consecrated. Wherefore, full faith shall be given to them, if they remain personally, or give security, if that be in their power, or on oath."

The Bishops of Rome and Alexandria are here called Archbishops. We may, therefore, infer that Antioch and Jerusalem would have the same title, as indicative of patriarchal authority. But we have no direct evidence of this earlier than the thirty sixth Canon of the Council in Trullo, A. D. 601. "Renewing," say the Fathers of that Council, "the decrees of the hundred and fifty holy Fathers assembled in this divinely protected and Imperial city, (Constantinople) and of the six hundred and thirty assembled in Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal privileges (*πρεσβειαν*) with the See of Ancient Rome, and be exalted like that in all ecclesiastical matters, as being second to it. After that let the See of the great city of Alexandria be reckoned; then that of Antioch, and after that the See of Jerusalem."

We come now to consider the title of PATRIARCH—to see when it was introduced, to what other titles it was equivalent, and by what powers it was accompanied.

The name, being of Hellenistic origin, is used in the Septuagint, 1 Chron. xxvii. 22, and 2 Chron. xxiii. 20. The high-

* It is stated in the Apology of Athanasius. that the number of Egyptian Bishops in his time, (i. e. a century earlier,) amounted to more than one hundred. The small number present at the Council of Chalcedon is an evidence of their aversion to the purpose for which it was assembled.

est officer of the Jewish Synagogue bore the title from the destruction of Jerusalem to the fifth century, when it was suppressed. [*Cod. Theodos. Lib. xvi; Tit. viii, de Judæis, &c., Lex. xxix.*] At the second General Council, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, used it oratorically and figuratively of Bishops. The latter for example, in a funeral oration, called the deceased Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, "our Jacob," and the Bishops, "his sons, the patriarchs." And this probably led the historian Socrates, who wrote after the year 440, to date the commencement of the patriarchal authority in the Church from the third Canon of that Council, and the rescript of Theodosius ad Auxonium. Fortunately, we have the documents from which he drew his inference, and are therefore able to correct his mistake. After stating the decree that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the precedence of honor after the Bishop of Rome, he proceeds as follows: "And they *constituted Patriarchs*, distributing the provinces so that the Bishops should not go beyond each Diocese to the Churches out of their limits; for previously, on account of the persecutions, this was done indiscriminately. To Nectarius," (the new Bishop of Constantinople, consecrated by the Council,) "was allotted the great city," (i. e. Constantinople,) "and Thrace," (i. e. the Thracian Diocese.) "Helladius, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, the successor of Basil, and Gregory, the brother of Basil, Bishop of Nyssa, which is also a city of Cappadocia, and Otreius, the Bishop of Melitene in Armenia, obtained the Patriarchate of the Pontic Diocese. The Asiatic Diocese was allotted to Amphilo-chius, Bishop of Iconium, and Optimus, Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia. The affairs of Egypt were assigned in the distribution to Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria. The administration of the Eastern Churches they committed to Bishops of the same, namely, Pelagius of Laodicea, and Diodorus of Tarsus, preserving, however, its privileges or precedence (*τὰ πρεσβεία*) to the Church of Antioch, which precedence they gave to Meletius then present. They decreed, moreover, that if need required, the Council of each province should administer the affairs of each province. To all this the Emperor gave his suffrage; and thus the Council was terminated." [*Socr. H. E., Lib. v. cap. 8. Ed. Reading, vol. 2, p. 270—271.*]

The fallacy of this statement, so far as the word Patriarch is concerned, will easily be detected by an examination of the *Notitiæ Imperii* we have laid before our readers. For Socrates speaks of *one* Patriarch in the Diocese of Thrace, *three* in that of Pontus, *two* in the Asiatic, *one* in the Egyptian, and

three, that is two in addition to the Bishop of Antioch, in the Oriental. It is perfectly evident, therefore, that he used the term Patriarch in a sense peculiar to himself, and very different from that employed at a later period. Sozomen, in his account of the same facts, (*H. E. Lib. vii. cap. 9*, ut sup. p. 289,) makes no mention of Patriarchs, but says that "the Emperor made a law that the Churches every where should be surrendered to those who acknowledged one and the same Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the substance of three persons of equal power and majesty;" and to prevent all doubt or equivocation in this matter, it was added that they should be surrendered "to those who held communion with Nectarius, in Constantinople—with Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria, in Egypt—with Diodorus, of Tarsus, and Pelagius, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, for the Eastern Churches—with Amphilochius of Iconium, in the Asian Diocese—in the cities of the Pontic Diocese, from Bithynia to the two Armenias—with Helladius of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, Gregory, of Nyssa, and Otreius, of Melitene; and in the cities of Thracia and Scythia, with Terentius, Bishop of Tomi, and Martyrius, of Marcianopolis. For these Bishops the Emperor himself knew and approved, and they had the reputation of governing their Churches piously." As this accords with the law of Theodosius on the subject, which our learned readers will find at the bottom of the page, we think there is every reason to consider this as a mere temporary arrangement to meet a present exigency, and not the appointment of permanent Patriarchs.* It was in fact a contrivance to get rid of the Arian

* *Codex Theodosianus*, Lib. xvi, Tit. 1. *De Fide Catholica*. Ed. Gothof. Tom. vi. pars i, p. 10.—III. Theodosius A. A. A. ad Auxonium Proc. Asiæ. Episcopis tradi omnes Ecclesias mox jubemus, qui unius majestatis atque virtutis Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, confitentur, ejusdem gloriæ, charitatis unius; nihil dissonum profana divisione facientes, sed Trinitatis ordinem, personarum adserctionem et divinitatis unitatem: Quos constabit communione Nectarii Episcopi Constantinopolitanæ Ecclesiæ, Timothei, nec non intra Aegyptum Alexandrinæ Urbis Episcopo esse Sociatos; quos etiam in *Oriente* partibus, Pelagio Episcopo Laodicensi, et Diodoro Episcopo Tarsensi: in *Asia* nec non Proconsulari, atque Asiatica Diocesi, Amphilocio Episcopo Iconiensi, et optimo Episcopo Antiocheno: in *Pontica* Diocesi, Helladio Episcopo Cæsariensi, et Otreio Meliteno, et Gregorio Episcopo Nysseno: Terennio Episcopo Scythiæ, Marmario Episcopo Marcianop. communicare constiterit: Hos ad obtinendas Catholicas Ecclesias ex communione et consortio probabilium sacerdotum oportebit admitti. Omnes autem qui ab eorum, quos commemoratio specialis expressit, fidei communione dissentiant, ut manifestos hæreticos ab Ecclesiis expelli, neque his penitus posthac obtinendarum Ecclesiarum Pontificium, facultatemque permitti, ut veræ ac Nicenæ fidei sacerdotia casta permaneant: nec post evidentem præcepti nostri formam malignæ locus detur astutiæ. Dat. iii kalend. Aug. (July 30th) Heracl. Eucherio et Syagrio cons. (A. D. 381.)

and Macedonian Bishops who had obtained or kept possession of their Sees, through the favor of preceding Emperors. The reader of the early ecclesiastical historians can not but perceive that the troubles introduced by the Arian heresy, and the subsequent evils by which the Church was harassed, were greatly aggravated by the interposition of Imperial authority. In this instance the interference was on the side of truth, but it was an expedient of worldly policy fraught with pernicious consequences which might never have occurred if the Church had been left to her own legislation.

The defenders of the Roman primacy are sadly embarrassed by the third Canon of Constantinople. Baronius wholly omits it as spurious; and most writers of that communion endeavor to explain it away. Le Quien maintains that the Roman Church did not approve it; that the Bishop of Alexandria at a later period reproached the Bishop of Antioch for the conduct of his See on that occasion, in the betrayal of their common cause; and he quotes the assertion of John of Antioch, to the Emperor at the Council of Ephesus, as evidence of the dissatisfaction of those Bishops, that Cyril of Alexandria, and Memnon of Ephesus, condemned Nestorius, because they expected to receive as the reward of their iniquity the restitution of their lost honors. (*Oriens Christianus*, vol. i, p. 18.) The Canon, no doubt, exhibits internal evidence of the Imperial policy to exalt Constantinople at the expense of Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus; and we know from the narrative of Sozomen, the very active part which the Emperor took in the proceedings of the Council. But the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, perhaps through fear of the Emperor, subscribed; and no protest can be found, or other public expression of dissent, on the part of Rome or Ephesus. On the contrary, in the admirable letter of the Bishops of this Council to those of the West, they speak of the Church of Constantinople as one newly founded and established, by the common consent of the Bishops assembled in a General Council, in presence of the most religious Emperor, and to the satisfaction of all the clergy and all the people. And in the answer of Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, where there would have been a fair opportunity to have expressed his dissatisfaction, not a word is said on the subject. (*See Theodoret, H. I., Lib. v. cap. 9 and 10.*) The only innovation, therefore, at the second General Council, was the act of placing Constantinople, as the new capital of the Empire, before Alexandria and Antioch, in the rank of cities; and however disagreeable that might be to Rome, it was not

then considered as an Ecclesiastical offense. No other names of office and dignity were in use as we have already remarked, but Bishop and Metropolitan. Even so late as in A. D. 397, in the third Council of Carthage, under Aurelius the Bishop of that Metropolis, it was expressly enacted "that the Bishop of the first See may not be called prince of priests, or High Priest, or any thing of the sort, but simply Bishop of the first See."* The Greek paraphrast for prince of priests reads ἐξάρχος τῶν ἱερέων, *Exarch* of priests. If this was done with knowledge of the proceedings of the second General Council, held sixteen years before, of which we can not entertain a doubt, it affords positive proof that no idea of patriarchal authority yet existed.

The first use of the title of Patriarch in an official document occurred in A. D. 449, during the correspondence which preceded the Council of Chalcedon. In the rescript of Theodosius Junior to Valentinianus, and again in the rescript of the same Emperor to his mother, Placidia, the Bishop of Rome is called ὁ εὐλαβεστάτος πατριάρχης Λέων, "the most religious or Reverend Patriarch Leo." (*Conc. Chalced. Pars. i. cap. 24, 25. Harduin. Tom. 2, p. 410.*) At that Council, October 8, A. D. 451, the Oriental Bishops, after anathematizing Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, cried out Λέοντος πολλά τὰ ἔτη. "Long live Leo! Long live the Patriarch!" (*Evagrii. H. E. Reading, vol. iii, p. 313, 30.*) From that time the title of Patriarch became established.

If we inquire to what other titles it was equivalent, we shall find that as Metropolitan denoted the first Bishop of each Province, so Patriarch was used at the period of which we are speaking to denote the first Bishop of a Diocese.

In the second action of the Council of Chalcedon (*Harduin Concilia vol. ii, p. 285.*) the Archons and Senate proposed "that the most holy *Patriarchs of the several Dioceses* should choose one or two from each Diocese, who should assemble and consult together concerning the faith, and propose what might be clearly satisfactory to the whole." We have seen that according to the civil arrangement of the empire, each of the great Dioceses was governed by a Vicarius or *Exarch*; and that the Patriarchs of the several Dioceses, mentioned by

* *Beveregii Pand. Can. vol. 1, p. 567. Can. xlii. Harduin. Concilia, vol. 1, p. 883. Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africana, Can. xxxix.*—Ut primæ sedis Episcopus non dicatur Sacerdotum princeps, vel summus Sacerdos vel aliquid hujus modi, sed tantum primæ sedis Episcopus. There are some various readings in the several copies, but they are the same in substance. At this Council the celebrated St. Augustine sat and subscribed.

the Archons and Senate, were also called *Exarchs* in the Church, appears, if we mistake not, from the phraseology of two of the Canons of this Council. In the Ninth Canon it is provided, that if a clergyman has cause of complaint against his own or any other Bishop, he may appeal to the provincial Council; and that if a Bishop or Clergyman have cause of complaint against the Metropolitan of the Province, he may appeal either to the *Exarch of the Diocese*, or to the See of Imperial Constantinople. A similar provision occurs in the Seventeenth Canon. The Provincial Council is to decide questions as to the limits of jurisdiction between two Bishops; but if one of the parties think himself unjustly treated by his Metropolitan, he may appeal to the *Exarch of the Diocese*, or to the See of Constantinople.

It appears, then, that notwithstanding the fears by which the Bishops of Africa were moved, so late as the year 397, the title and authority of *Exarch of the several Dioceses* was admitted by the Council of Chalcedon in 451; and that this title and authority was in fact what the Fathers of that Council understood by the title of *Patriarch*, to which it was considered as equivalent. Now as neither Leo of Rome, nor Dioscorus of Alexandria, nor Juvenal of Jerusalem were present; and as two only, Anatolius of Constantinople, and Maximus of Antioch, could not come up to the meaning of the terms, "*Patriarchs of the several Dioceses*," it follows that all the Dioceses were meant to be included, and consequently that the Ecclesiastical Exarch of each Diocese was now called *Patriarch*. This, be it observed, was the usage which commenced even so late as the middle of the fifth century.

But it did not rest here. The Emperors were bent upon exalting the See of their Imperial City; and in A. D. 536, the Novellæ of Justinian called Anthemius, Bishop of Constantinople, "the most blessed Archbishop and ECUMENICAL (or Universal) PATRIARCH—Patriarch of the whole Roman Empire! This arrogant title offered by the Emperor, was not immediately accepted. More than fifty years passed before John, surnamed the Faster, assembled a Council in Constantinople, who by a Synodical Decree conferred it upon him in A. D. 587. The Church now became a partaker in the sin; and it effectually roused the jealousy of the Bishop of Rome. The well-known letter by which Gregory, surnamed the Great, expostulated with John, demands of him, "What canst thou answer, in the scrutiny of the last judgment, to CHRIST the true head of the Universal Church, for this attempt, by the appellation of Universal Bishop, to subject all his members to thy-

self."* Gregory repeatedly asserts that the title of Œcumenical Bishop was *offered* to Leo I, in the Council of Chalcedon, and *refused* by him and all his successors in office. This is stated in his letter to the Bishop of Constantinople, to Mauricius Augustus, (*ubi sup.* col. 749,) and to the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. (col. 771.) It will be sufficient to quote only the last, which we do in the margin.† Now supposing this *profane title*, as Gregory calls it, had been offered and refused, the inference is irresistible, that no divine right had ever been claimed for it. It was an ecclesiastical grant of no earlier date than the fourth General Council; and *this by the concession of the Bishop of Rome himself, at the close of the sixth century.* But it is curious to observe on what slight grounds so large an assertion is built. In the third action of the Council of Chalcedon, four libelli or memorials were presented from one Presbyter, two Deacons, and a layman of the Church of Alexandria, praying the Council to depose their Patriarch Dioscorus. These libelli were addressed τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ οἰκουμένικῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ρώμης Λέοντι, "to the most holy and most blessed Universal Archbishop and Patriarch of Great Rome, Leo, and to the holy and Universal Synod of Chalcedon." After the reading of these libelli, the Council directed that they should all be entered on the records. The Council itself never used the title, and certainly never offered it to Leo who was not personally present. It was an act of adulation of four obscure Egyptians; but the Benedictine editors, to excuse the illogical inference of St. Gregory, tenderly remark, that when the libelli were read, the Council did not reprobate the title!

There remains but one point more to examine on this part of our subject. What did the Nicene Fathers mean, when in their Sixth Canon they assigned as a reason for the authority of the Bishop of Alexandria over Egypt, Lybia, and Penta-

* S. Greg. Regist. Epist. Lib. v. Indic. xiii. Epist. 18. Ed. Bened. Tom. ii, col. 742. For further particulars see Dr. Jarvis's Reply to Milner, pp. 236—246. "Ut quid CHRISTO universalis scilicet Ecclesiæ capiti, in extremi iudicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibi met conaris universalis appellatione supponere?"

† S. Greg. Epist. Lib. v. Epist. 43. "Sicut enim veneranda mihi vestra sanctitas novit, per sanctam Chalcedonensem Synodum, Pontificii sedis Apostolicæ, cui Deo disponente deservio, hoc UNIVERSITATIS NOMEN OBLATUM EST. Sed nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam PROFANO vocabulo uti consensit: quia videlicet si unus Patriarcha universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. Sed absit hoc, absit a Christiani mente, id sibi velle quempiam arripere, unde fratrum suorum honorem imminuere ex quantulacumque parte videatur. Cum ergo nos hunc honorem nolumus, oblatum suscipere, pensate quam ignominiosum sit hunc sibi quempiam violenter usurpare voluisse."

polis, that the Bishop of Rome had a similar custom? The country thus defined as subject to the See of Alexandria, constituted, in the civil division of the Empire, the Egyptian Diocese. A similar custom with respect to Rome would mean the Regio Suburbicaria, subject to the officer called the Præfectus urbi. As the ancient customs of the Egyptian Diocese subjected all its Provinces to the Bishop of Alexandria, so the ancient customs of Rome subjected the whole suburbicarian region to the Bishop of Rome. If this be the meaning, then the territorial jurisdiction of both, would correspond with that of the civil Vicarius or Exarch of a Diocese, and consequently would correspond with what has been shown to be the Patriarchal authority established at a much later period by the Council of Chalcedon. Now it is certain that the Præfecture of the city was introduced by Augustus. Suetonius explicitly states the fact, (*Octavianus*, c. 37;) and Dion Cassius tells us that his government extended 750 stadia, or 100 miles in every direction around Rome. (*Dion. Cass. Hist. Rom.*, Lib. lii, Sec. 21, 22.) Beyond the hundredth mile stone the country was called Italy. Such being the bounds of the suburbicarian region, so early as in the reign of Augustus—bounds which do not appear to have been changed by Constantine—we can easily see how the practice would grow up in the Church of subjecting the whole region to the See of Rome. And that such was the received interpretation of the Sixth Canon of Nice in the Latin Church appears from the Ecclesiastical History of Rufinus, a Presbyter of Aquileia, the Metropolis of the first province in the Italic Diocese. As he flourished in A. D. 390, only sixty-five years after the Council of Nice, and his history begins with the rise of the Arian heresy, it may properly be called the contemporaneous interpretation. He gives the following summary of the Sixth Nicene Canon: "Ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma, vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat, (*Ruffini Hist. Eccl. Op.* vol. i, p. 199,) "that in Alexandria, and in the city of Rome the ancient custom be preserved; so that the one may have the care of Egypt, the other, of the SUBURBICARIAN CHURCHES." Such had been the custom before the Council of Nice. Let the Bishop of Rome go back to that, and we are content. All else is encroachment.

We have now traced, as far as we promised, the changes which took place in the external arrangement and discipline of the Church. To go further would be unnecessary and inconsistent with our limits. What was at first usage, was afterwards conceded and claimed as right. Authority was

acquired by custom, and followed the increase of civil power.

But there is another aspect in which the proceedings of the Council of Nice are to be viewed. We have seen that the opinion hastily and improperly adopted by some, concerning the origin of the Patriarchal government, at the first General Council, is untrue. Eusebius, in his account of what the Council did, says nothing of it. Constantine in his address to the people concerning the Council says nothing of it. Socrates and Sozomen are equally silent. Would none of them have mentioned a matter of so much importance, if so great a change had taken place? It is impossible to believe it. The whole action of the Nicene Council makes Alexandria and Rome the exception, not the rule; for after sanctioning their ancient usages, the Sixth Canon adds the important clause, "with regard to Antioch, and IN THE OTHER PROVINCES let their privileges be PRESERVED to the Churches." All those Provinces, therefore, which ancient usage had NOT placed under Alexandria, Rome and Antioch, were to *retain that usage and consequently to be independent*. In consequence of this important clause, the Council of Ephesus in 431, by its Eighth Canon, rejected the claims of Antioch, and protected the independence of Cyprus, declaring that "*each province was to enjoy its ancient rights pure and inviolate*." But the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, disregarded the precedents of Nice and Ephesus, and deprived of their ancient privileges, the twenty-eight provinces of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian Dioceses, by subjecting them to the See of Constantinople. Thenceforth their Metropolitans were to be consecrated, not by the Bishops of each Province, but by the Bishop of New Rome. To him an ultimate appeal was granted from their decisions; and under him, as it would seem, the Bishops of the three principal Metropoles were appointed over the three Dioceses above named as Ecclesiastical Exarchs. It was the design of the Emperors to exalt Constantinople and not Rome; and therefore we find no acts for the enlargement of the Roman jurisdiction. But this unjust partiality towards the new seat of Empire, constantly excited to feverish impatience and jealousy the pride of its more ancient rival, sowed continually new seeds of division, and co-operating with other causes, finally raised the Bishops of Rome to more than imperial dignity. The profound and thoughtful historian of the Florentine Republic, in his admirably condensed view of the rise of Papal power in Italy, remarks:* "The arrival of the Lombards and the division of

Machiavelli Istorie Fiorentine, Libro i, Opere, 1826. Vol. i, p. 23. "Venuti i Longobardi, e ridotta Italia in più parti, dettero cagione al Papa di farsi più vivo;

Italy into several parts, gave to the Pope increased vitality ; for being head, as it were, in Rome, the Emperor of Constantinople and the Lombards held him in respect ; so that by the intervention of the Pope, the Romans formed leagues either with the Lombards or with Longinus, not as subjects but as equals. And by this procedure the Popes, from being friends at one time with the Lombards, at another with the Greeks, increased their dignity."

But to return to the period of the fourth General Council : During its seventh action, by special agreement between the Bishops Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, and at their request, the two Phœnicias and Arabia were placed under the jurisdiction of the former, and the three Palestines under that of the latter. (*Harduin. Concilia.* vol. ii, p. 492.) By the several provisions then of the Council of Chalcedon, the Ecclesiastical arrangement of the several parts of the Roman Empire in A. D. 451, appears to have been as follows : I. The whole Oriental Diocese, excepting the province of Cyprus*, which the Council of Ephesus had pronounced to be *αὐτοκέφαλη*, or independent, was under the jurisdiction of the Bishops of Antioch and Jerusalem. II. The whole of the Egyptian Diocese under the Bishop of Alexandria. III. The Asiatic, Pontic and Thracian Dioceses, under the Bishop of Constantinople. These five Dioceses, as we have seen, formed the Præfecture of the East. The two Dioceses containing eleven provinces which formed the Præfecture of Illyricum, that is the Macedonian and Dacian, probably preserved the ancient privileges of their several provinces, and were therefore Autocephalæ, or independent. So were the Spanish, Gallic and British Dioceses, contained in the Præfecture of the Gauls. Of the three Dioceses under the Præfectus-prætorio of Italy, the West Illyric and African were independent ; the Italic, subdivided under the Ecclesiastical Exarchs of Aquileia, Ravenna, and Mediolanum, or Milan. The suburbicarian region, subject in civil matters to the Præfectus Urbi, was, as we have seen, under the Bishop of Rome.

perchè sendo quasi che capo in Roma, l'Imperatore di Costantinopoli e i Longobardi gli avevano rispetto, talmentechè i Romani, mediante il Papa, non come soggetti, ma come compagni con i Longobardi, e con Longino si collegarono. E così sequitando i Papi, ora di essere Amici dei Longobardi, ora de' Greci, la loro dignità accrescevano."

* It may be worthy of remark, that even at this day, as we have been informed by the well known learned Greek, E. A. Sophocles, the Metropolitan of Cyprus retains and is tenacious of his ancient privileges. He is, therefore, addressed by the title of *makariôtatos*, most blessed, and signs his name with *red ink*: both which distinctions belong of right to the Patriarchs.

But we have now come to another very important matter, which adds new force to what we have said of the Ecclesiastical Independence of the twenty-nine provinces, concerning which we are about to speak. According to Zosimus, (Lib. vi, cap. 5, 6,) the whole Præfecture of the Gauls, including the Spanish, Gallic and British Dioceses, revolted from the Roman dominion in A. D. 408; and the weakness of the Empire was such that the Emperor Honorius, obliged by the invasion of Alaric, to concentrate all his forces in Italy, wrote letters to the cities of Britain in A. D. 410, exhorting them to provide for their own security. (*Zos. ut sup.* cap. 10.) This was a virtual recognition of their independence; and it took place, be it observed, twenty-nine years after the second General Council, twenty-one years before the third, and forty-one before the fourth. There were at that time in Britain ninety-two considerable towns which had grown up under the protection of the Romans, and among these thirty-three cities, two of which were *Municipia*, nine *Colonies*, ten *Latii jure donatæ*, and twelve *Stipendiariæ* of eminent note. (*Gibbon Decl. and Fall*, chap. xxxi, vol. v, p. 361, *note*.) What proportion of the inhabitants were Christians, we have no means of ascertaining. That they were numerous may be gathered from incidental notices, and from the fact that three Bishops sat and subscribed at the Council of Arles in 314, a year before the new arrangement of the Empire under Constantine. Two of these Bishops, Eborius and Restitutius, were from the Metropolitan cities of York and London. It is inferred, therefore, that the city of which Adelfius was the Bishop, was also Metropolitan, though its position is unknown.* The relinquishment of jurisdiction by the state, at this early period, involved a corresponding independence with regard to the subsequent ecclesiastical arrangements of the Roman Empire. Whatever influence, therefore, the enactments of the Council of Chalcedon may have had upon those parts which preserved their allegiance to the Emperor, they could have none over the Island of Britain, where the ancient provincial privileges remained as they had been left by the provisions of the Nicene Council. So little connection had the British Church with Rome, at the beginning of the seventh century, that Augustine, the Missionary of Gregory the Great to the idolatrous

* See the signatures in *Hard. Concilia*. vol. i, col. 267, among those of the Gallic prefecture. There were eight Bishops, one Presbyter, and seven Deacons of Gaul; three Bishops of Britain, with one Presbyter and one Deacon; and from Spain, one Bishop, five Presbyters and three Deacons.

Saxons, was surprised when he learned that the Britons were Christians. In the interview which he had with their Bishops, he required them to receive him as their Archbishop, to celebrate Easter and to baptize in the Roman manner, and to preach the Gospel with him to the Saxons. "But," says Bede, "they could be moved neither by prayers, nor exhortations, nor threats." Augustine treated them with insolence, and because they refused to acknowledge his authority, turned against them the arms of his new converts. (*Bede Ven. Eccl. Hist. Lib. ii, cap. 2.*)

At the Reformation, the Church of England, while she acknowledged the doctrines of the first four General Councils, merely resumed the *πρωτοεστία*, the original privileges of the British Church. She returned to that independence which by the ancient Canons belonged of right to her Provinces, and which had been taken from her by an unjust usurpation, and the weak concessions of her princes. In the re-construction of her ritual, she did no more than was done by Augustine according to the sage advice of Gregory: "Choose carefully whatsoever you find in the Roman, or Gallic, or any other Church, most pleasing to God, and that which you can collect from many Churches infuse into the Church of England." (*S. Gregory Op. Ed. Bened. vol. ii, col. 1152. The whole passage, with a few various readings is quoted by Bede, Eccl. Hist. Lib. i, c. 27.*) In the renewal of her Provincial Councils, following the analogy of primitive practice, she adapted their forms to the Constitution of the State. Her Convocations were divided into an upper and lower house; the Archbishop and Bishops forming the one, and the representatives of the Clergy in the several Dioceses, the other; the assent of both being necessary in the enactment of Canons, and the consent of Parliament as a Lay-Synod, being also required, according to the great principle laid down by Hooker in the eighth Book of his Ecclesiastical Polity. On this point we have given our views in our last number, and they need not here be repeated.* We shall only observe, that no sacrifice of worldly prosperity can be too great, to relieve the Church of England from her present bondage to the State. Happy will she be, if in the present eventful struggle, she can be restored to the freedom wherewith CHRIST had made her free.

If Britain, once a part of the Roman Empire, has been emancipated from the thralldom which Imperial interference

* See the article on "Dr. Hampden, and Church and State," in the July Number.

first created, it would be in the highest degree absurd to suppose that the United States of America should ever come under the dominion of an Italian Bishop. "Quid Romæ faciam? Mentiri nescio." Freed from all embarrassing union with civil government, the Church is here, as it was before the days of Constantine. Her external form is according to the earliest pattern of Ecclesiastical discipline, when Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons were known by no other title. At first a feeble flock, the United States constituted one vast Province. Our General Convention differs from the ancient Provincial Synods, chiefly in being adapted, agreeably to the analogy of ancient practice, to our peculiar civil institutions. But the time is fast approaching when a more exact conformity to Apostolic arrangement will become necessary. Our Dioceses must be smaller; our Bishops more numerous; our Provincial Synods more frequent, while our General or National Synods will not be convened oftener than once in seven or ten years. New England will be by itself a compact and convenient Province; New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, Virginia, and the larger states, as the numbers of the Clergy and laity increase, must be divided according to the ratio of souls, rather than of territory. To prevent inconvenience, the Bishop of the first See, may at the Provincial Synods, have the precedence of honor, but never of power. Whenever a National Council is called, an election of its president in both branches will be expedient.

There has been no truly General Council since that of Constantine; and whether there will ever be another, must depend upon events which are still hidden in the womb of time. The fourth great monarchy has crumbled into ruins, and will hardly be re-established. The abortive attempt of Charlemagne fell from the hands of his feeble sons. Transferred to Germany, it continued its turbulent existence, hating and being hated, till an Italian, a soldier of fortune, sought to transfer its diadem and its sceptre to his own brow and hand. He perished upon a rock in the ocean *without having even seen Rome*; and his infant offspring by a German Empress, named in his cradle, as if by mockery, "King of Rome," passed from the earth, unheeded and unknown. The last feeble remnant of the House of Hapsburg has this year fled from his Capital, and a war of races has begun. We are no prophets, but the sons of herdsmen; and we wait on the issues of Omnipotence with awful stillness. The LORD JESUS CHRIST is the only universal king; the HOLY GHOST presiding invisibly over the Church his only Vicegerent, until He shall come again to judge in righteousness the world He has redeemed.

THE ORIGIN AND USES OF THE CREEDS.

ART. II.—*An Exposition of the Creed.* By JOHN PEARSON, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Chester. With an Appendix, containing the principal Greek and Latin Creeds. 8vo. pp. 616. New York: 1844.

The Christian Faith explained and vindicated, in several Sermons on the chief Articles of it contained in the Apostles' Creed. By ISAAC BARROW, D. D., Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Barrow's Works, 3 vols. 8 vo. New York: 1845.

The Primitive Creed, examined and explained; in two parts. The first part containing sixteen discourses on the Apostles' Creed; designed for popular use. The second part containing a dissertation on the Testimony of the Early Councils and the Fathers, from the Apostolic Age to the end of the Fourth Century, with observations on certain Theological Errors of the present day. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. 12 mo., pp. 415. Burlington: 1834.

NEW editions of standard works on Christian doctrine, and the appearance of new treatises upon the same subject, we hail as most favorable indications. Three centuries have now passed away since Bishop Pearson gave to the world his immortal Exposition, and yet editions almost numberless have since appeared, and will, we venture to predict, continue to appear, while the English language shall be spoken, and while the incomparable theological literature of the age in which he flourished shall excite the admiration, enrich the minds, and form the piety of Christian scholars. We frankly acknowledge ourselves to be great admirers of this venerable treatise, for without intending to disparage other learned and approved laborers in the same important field, we are compelled to regard its author as still standing unrivalled. An eminent clergyman, now no longer present with the militant Church, when asked how he passed the leisure hours of his Diaconate, replied, "*In studying Bishop Pearson,*" a practice which can not be too strongly recommended to all ranks of ministers, especially to candidates for Holy Orders. In saying this, we do not forget that Pearson on the Creed is a Text Book in our General Seminary, and that it is there most carefully and thoroughly taught by the honored Professor of Systematic Divinity; but we desire to see it adopted and *used*, not mere-

ly in the way of occasional reference, but in that of regular recitation of every portion, in *all* our theological schools. Even the biographer of Richard Watson, the Wesleyan preacher, can appreciate the merits of Pearson; much more should every true son of the Catholic Church. "The profound, original, and orthodox views of revealed truth, which that incomparable work contains, would have served to settle Mr. Watson's mind, and fix his theological principles; the perfect simplicity and rugged terseness of its diction, would have corrected that taste for excessive rhetorical ornament, into which juvenile minds are apt to fall; and the ample body of notes with which it is enriched, would have called forth his classical learning, and have been an excellent introduction to the study of ecclesiastical history, especially in regard to Christian doctrine."

With Bishop Pearson, Dr. Barrow was contemporary, and accordingly we might suppose, that in writing upon the same general subject, there would be between them very many points of close and marked resemblance; and yet there can not easily be found two authors of the same period and language, and above all of the same profession, who are so dissimilar in style, in manner, in arrangement, in illustration, in short, in every thing which is characteristic of authorship, as are these two distinguished divines. We can not perhaps better express our own estimation of the difference between these Christian expositors, than by comparing Bishop Pearson to an experienced traveler, who, on undertaking a journey, takes with him no more apparel and apparatus than will be absolutely essential to his safety and comfort; while Dr. Barrow is more like the man, who for the first time in his life venturing forth from his home, fills his trunks and valises with numerous articles, which, though possibly useful under some circumstances, he finds from actual experience he does not need; not that his entire outfit is altogether superfluous, but that with fewer accompaniments he would move more rapidly and pleasantly. Some persons may be ready to judge, that since Bishop Pearson and Dr. Barrow, and other divines of the Church of England, have written so much at large upon the Creeds, it was quite unnecessary for an American theologian to essay the same subject. But if, after reading these older authors, they will give Bishop Hopkins' work an attentive perusal, they will, we think, be of another opinion. Every passing age of the Church has its peculiar errors; and hence the necessity of making new books, to defend old truths against the assaults of modern heresiarchs. This the Bishop of Vermont has done

most ably in his remarks upon Unitarianism, Universalism, and some other recent perversions of the ancient gospel.

Before tracing the history of our Creeds and noticing their uses, as we purpose to do in the present article, we must not neglect to call the especial attention of our readers to the most valuable Appendix in Bishop Pearson's volume, and also to the Dissertations in that of Bishop Hopkins, since they will there find the Creeds of the early Church chronologically arranged, and thus see for themselves what was the faith at first delivered to the Saints, for which we are all required earnestly to contend.

No one can open our Book of Common Prayer without perceiving that both in our Morning and Evening Service there are two Creeds: the shorter one called the Apostles' Creed, whether drawn up by the Apostles or not, will appear before we conclude our remarks; the longer one, that which stands second in order, called the Nicene Creed, because the principal part of it was adopted by the celebrated council of Nice, held in the year of our Lord 325.

By turning to our Eighth Article of Religion, we shall see the estimation in which these Creeds are held by the English and American churches. "The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by the most certain warrants of Scripture." Our object at present will however not be, either to point out the agreement of these Creeds with the word of God, to explain the meaning, or to enforce the practical application of their several articles, but our design will be simply to discover from historical documents, the authenticity of which has never been called in question, **THE SOURCES WHENCE THE CREEDS ARE DERIVED; and also to mention THE SEVERAL VALUABLE PURPOSES THESE CREEDS SUBSERVE IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.**

To our apprehension, the importance of the simple inquiry which we have proposed for ourselves, is very much greater than can be apparent at first sight. In the prosecution of the inquiry, we shall be enabled to perceive what are the sure foundations upon which our most holy faith doth rest, as well as to determine by what infallible rules we are to judge between truth and error, between what must be admitted into our belief, and that which is to be rejected as unworthy either of our regard or of our credit.

I. In instituting an inquiry into **THE ORIGIN OF OUR TWO CREEDS**, we shall commence with that which is called the Nicene, or the Creed which stands the second in order in our

Morning and Evening Service ; and we shall thus begin, principally because an examination into the sources whence the Nicene Creed was derived, will enable us to ascertain with greater ease the origin of the symbol called the Apostles' Creed.

1. In searching into the origin of the Nicene Creed, we shall fix upon the year of our Lord 381, as the point whence we are to direct the line of our inquiries upward towards the time of the Apostles. We fix upon this period, because it was in this year that the entire Creed, as it now stands in our Prayer Books, with the exception of the words, "And the Scriptures," in the third part, which were added in the year 447, was set forth by the First Council of Constantinople ; and we may remark in passing, that the Creed, as set forth by this Council, continues to be the Creed of that extensive portion of Christendom denominated the Greek or Eastern Church ; and as we receive the same Creed, it is a bond of union between ourselves and all the Oriental Churches.

2. The next step we advance towards the times of the Apostles, in our examination into the origin of the Creed under consideration, is the year 325. This year is distinguished in the history of the Christian Church, as the year in which the first General Council was held. The Council is called General, because the Bishops and others who composed it came from every part of the Christian world, and the Council is memorable for having embodied the testimony of the whole Christian Church, as to what was then the universally received faith. This first General Council was assembled at Nice in Bythynia, about 70 miles south-east of Constantinople ; and the Creed, which was adopted during the session of the Council, is hence called the Nicene Creed. It received, as we have already intimated, a few additions, especially in its third part, some fifty years after, at the Council of Constantinople ; but as its substance remained unaltered, its name was not changed.

3. Here, at this point of our inquiry, a very important question arises, which is this : Was the Creed adopted by the Nicene Council *composed* during its session ? or was the Creed in existence previous to this time ? In other words, did our longer Creed originate with the members of the Council of Nice ? or must its origin be referred to an earlier period ?

The importance of this question will be seen on a moment's reflection. If the Creed is the production of the Nicene Council, in this case it will be nothing more than the *opinions* of the Nicene fathers upon a series of theological questions ;

but in case the Creed, called the Nicene, existed prior to the Council of Nice, it may, on examination, assume a character altogether different from the mere expression of opinion, whether by a succession of individuals, or by an ecclesiastical assembly. We suppose that the more commonly received notion with regard to the Creed called the Nicene is, that it was called into being in the year of our Lord 325, that it had no prior existence, and that it therefore originated from the members of the Nicene Council. The name the Creed bears may have done something towards the formation of this opinion, and towards giving it currency; but whatever may have been its origin, we shall soon find, that this is quite contrary to the truth.

That the Creed, called the Nicene, was in existence a long time previous to the Council of Nice, is a fact supported by the most abundant and unquestionable testimony.

The first witness we shall bring forward, to show that the substance of the Creed we are considering, existed prior to the Nicene Council, is Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, who was a most prominent member of the Council, for he occupied the highest seat therein, next to the Emperor Constantine himself. In an Epistle which Eusebius wrote to his Church in Cesarea, written after the session of the Council, he expressly asserts, that with the exception of the phrase, "Very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father," the Creed adopted by the Nicene Council was the very same Creed which had been used in the Church of Cesarea for a long time previous.

That the reader may see how truly Eusebius has reported this matter, we here copy the Creed of the Church at Cesarea, as contained in his public Epistle addressed to his Diocese after the Nicene Council had set forth the symbol which bears its name:

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator of all things visible and invisible: and in one LORD JESUS CHRIST, the Word of God, *God of God, light of light*, life of life, the only begotten Son, the first born of every creature, begotten of his Father before all ages, by whom all things were made, who for our salvation was incarnate and conversed among men; who suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father; and who shall come again in glory to judge both the quick and the dead," &c.

This Creed of the Church at Cesarea, which Eusebius presented to the Council, and which was adopted thereby, after it

had received the additions just mentioned, Eusebius says "he received from the Bishops his predecessors; that he was taught it in the rudimental instructions of his childhood, and afterwards at the time of his baptism; and that he both believed and taught it when a Presbyter and a Bishop." In the same letter he also says that this had been his Creed "from the time he was capable of knowing himself."

Accordingly the testimony of Eusebius establishes these three facts:

(a.) That the Creed, adopted by the Council of Nice, contains no *new* doctrine; for even of the expression, "Of one substance with the Father," Eusebius expressly says in this same Epistle, that this phrase "had been used by some of the most learned and distinguished of the *ancient* Bishops and writers in treating of the divinity of the Father and the Son," so that according to the testimony of this witness, even the phrase, "Of one substance with the Father," was not first invented by the Nicene fathers, nor first used by them.

(b.) Eusebius also asserts, that this was the Creed, which he had known from his earliest childhood. But this historian was born about sixty years before the Council of Nice, so that the Creed, which he learned when a child, must be at least half a century earlier than the session of the Council; or, in other words, it must have been in existence as early as the year of our Lord 275.

(c.) But Eusebius likewise asserts that he received this Creed from the Bishops who preceded him in the Episcopate of Cesarea; an assertion which gives to the Creed still higher antiquity; and hence from the testimony of Eusebius alone respecting this Creed, we may justly conclude that it was in existence in the middle of the third century, or about one hundred and fifty years after the death of St. John, the last of the Apostles.

But even higher antiquity than this must be yielded to the faith expressed by the Creed, into the origin of which we are now examining.

The fathers of the Nicene Council positively assert, as a notorious and uncontroverted fact, that the doctrine, which they maintained and taught, was uninterruptedly derived from the Lord himself, through the medium of the Apostles. The words in which the whole body of the Nicene fathers make this assertion, our readers will wish to see, and therefore we now transcribe them:

"This is the Apostolic and blameless faith of the Church; which faith ultimately derived from the Lord himself, through

the Apostles, and handed down from our forefathers, to their successors, the Church religiously preserves and maintains the same, both now and forever."

We have already heard the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius asserting, that the faith expressed by the Creed, approved by the Council of Nice, he had learned in his earliest childhood, and that he had received it from the Bishops who preceded him in his Episcopal office ; but we now have the unanimous declaration of more than three hundred Bishops, that the faith contained in this Creed was the faith received by the universal Church, and that this faith had descended to men from the Apostles, and through the Apostles from our LORD JESUS CHRIST himself.

With regard to this remarkable testimony we must observe, that the individuals who utter it did not belong to a single city, nor to a single province, but they were the representatives of the whole Christian world ; they were Bishops who represented the various Christian Churches scattered from Spain on the West to Persia on the East ; from Gaul on the North to Lybia on the South ; for Eusebius affirms, that "the most distinguished ministers of God met together from every part of Europe, Asia and Africa ; the sacred edifice," [where they assembled,] "enclosing at the same time within its walls both Syrians and Cilicians, Arabians, and inhabitants of Palestine, Egyptians, Thebeans, and Lybians, with others arriving from Mesopotamia. A Bishop from Persia was also present ; nor was the Scythian absent from this assembly. Pontus also, and Galatia, Pamphylia and Cappadocia, Asia, and Phrygia, furnished representatives from their most able divines. Thracians, too, Macedonians, Achaïans, and Epirotes, and those who resided at a vast distance beyond them were convened. That illustrious Spaniard, who is so highly spoken of, took his seat with the others. The prelate of the imperial city," [Rome,] "was indeed absent on account of his advanced years, but his place was supplied by presbyters." Theodoret, another early ecclesiastical historian, says, that several of the members of this Council were esteemed on account of their past sufferings in the cause of our holy religion, still bearing in their bodies, like the great Apostle to the Gentiles, "the marks of the LORD JESUS."

Such the office, and such the character of these representatives of the universal Church, who were the authors of the declaration we have just cited. Is not their testimony entitled to credit ? Must they not have known what was the acknowledged faith in the several regions in which they resided ?

Could they have been mistaken with regard to such a plain matter of fact? Each Bishop must have known what doctrines were taught and received in his own Church; he must have known too whether the received doctrines were novelties, and whether they had descended from his predecessors, and from the earliest ages of Christianity. Is it possible that three hundred *Christian* Bishops, assembled from every part of the Christian world, could have been brought to unite in an unanimous declaration as to matters of fact, had the alledged facts been false! Would they, had they been sufficiently unprincipled to do so, have hazarded the assertion in the face of the whole world, when they must have been aware, that they were testifying to what was known to millions to be an untruth!

But this is not all the testimony there is to the early origin of the faith contained in the formulary, called the Nicene Creed; although it is quite impossible to see, why the testimony of the three hundred Bishops, assembled at Nice, is not perfectly satisfactory. Indeed it is altogether beyond our penetration to discover, how in the short space of two centuries from the death of the last of the Apostles—and this a period of cruel suffering and bloody persecution—the Christian faith should have become, in all the Churches, scattered from the Atlantic to the Tigris, and from the Danube to the tributaries of the Nile, universally corrupted and changed! But corrupted and changed the faith must have become, and this in the midst of all these opposing circumstances, if we suppose that these three hundred Bishops were mistaken, when they unanimously assert that the faith embodied in the Nicene symbol was ultimately derived from the Lord himself, through the Apostles, and that it was handed down from their forefathers to those who succeeded their ancestors in the sacred office!

But conclusive as is this testimony, it is by no means the whole of the evidence existing to the apostolic origin of the Creed we are noticing. Did the limits we have assigned to this discussion allow, we could show, that each article of this Creed can be traced up through an unbroken line of witnesses to the days of the Apostles themselves; Origin, who flourished in the year of our Lord 240, Tertullian in the year 200, and Irenæus in the year 175, himself the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John, having each left us a Creed, which in its great outlines corresponds with that which was set forth by the Council of Nice. But instead of occupying our space in showing how the articles can each be refer-

red to the period when the Apostles lived, we will select merely as an example a single article, and that the declaration of the Nicene Creed, concerning the person of our blessed **LORD**; and we select this article, because it is mainly on its account, that the Nicene Creed has met with the opposition it has encountered at various periods since its promulgation.

"I believe in one **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father."

We have already seen that the expression, "Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father," was by the Council of Nice added to the old Creed of the Church at *Cesarea*; and we have seen, moreover, that the members of this Council positively assert, that in these words they did not propose any new truth, their design in employing this phraseology being simply to guard from the invasions of error, a verity held by the whole Christian Church; and we have heard also the words of Eusebius, that "some of the most learned and distinguished of the *ancient* Bishops and writers had made use of the phrase, "Of one substance with the Father" in treating of the divinity of the Father and the Son; it remains therefore for us to state what these ancient Bishops and writers have said on this important doctrinal topic; inasmuch as these "learned and distinguished ancients" must be regarded as thus testifying to what was the universally received faith at the time in which they wrote.

Origen, a Presbyter of the Church at Alexandria, in Egypt, who flourished about the year 240, when stating what was the faith of the Church in his day, says: "We must pray to the Only Begotten, even to Him, *who was born before the whole creation*, the Word of God;" so that since, according to Origen, our Lord was born *before* the whole *creation*, he is himself uncreated, although born or begotten of the Father.

Tertullian, a Presbyter of the Church at Carthage, in Africa, flourished about the year 200, and composed, in the name of the suffering Church at large, a public apology for Christianity, addressed to the reigning Emperor Severus, so that Tertullian speaks in the name of the universal Church at the close of the second century, where he says: "The Word we say was *produced out of God, and in his production was generated*. From the *unity of substance*, therefore, he is called both God and the Son. The Word is *Spirit from Spirit*, and God from God. What hath *proceeded from God is both God and the Son of God, and they two are one God*." Such is the language

which this public apologist employs to explain the Christian faith to the Roman Emperor, professedly representing not his own views, but what was the received faith at the time; not expressing his opinion, but merely giving his testimony to a matter of fact.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, in France, flourished in the year 175. In his Treatise against Heresies, he thus states what was the faith of the Christian Church at this period; not giving his own notions, we must observe, but simply testifying to what was the universally received faith concerning the person of our LORD. "CHRIST himself, the Word of God, the only begotten of the Father, he is our God. Existing in the beginning with God, he is the Word who was always present with the human race, but who in these last times became man, capable of suffering, being united to his own workmanship: hence he did not, for the first time, begin to be the Son of God when he was incarnate and made man, but on the contrary he had always co-existed with the Father." In another passage Irenæus says: "God's Word was God by a necessary consequence, for that which is begotten from God is God."

It has been maintained by some modern writers that our Lord is called the Son of God merely on account of his conception by the Holy Ghost; but how repugnant is this opinion to the faith of the universal Church less than a century after the death of the last of the Apostles! "CHRIST did not for the first time begin to be the Son of God, when he was incarnate and made man, but on the contrary, he had ALWAYS CO-EXISTED with the Father."

"This faith," this same Bishop proceeds to affirm, "the Church, though dispersed through the whole world, hath received from the Apostles and their disciples; neither do the Churches, which are founded in Germany, believe otherwise, or deliver otherwise, nor do those which are in Iberias, or among the Celts, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Lybia, or in the central regions of the earth; but the Church, though scattered throughout the whole world, believes these matters as having one soul and the same heart, and she harmoniously preaches and declares, and delivers them as possessing only one mouth."

Such is the declaration of Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, himself being removed, as he assures us, from the Apostle St. John, by only a single intervening individual; for Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp, while Polycarp was the disciple of the Apostle himself. These facts are thus stated by Irenæus:

"Polycarp, also, who was not only instructed by the Apos-

ties and conversed with many of them, but was likewise by the Apostles made Bishop of the Church at Smyrna, in Asia, this Polycarp always taught us those things which he had learned from the Apostles themselves, which he also delivered to the Church, and which alone are true. When yet a boy, I was with Polycarp in the lower Asia. The instructions of our childhood grow with our growth, and adhere to us most closely ; so that I can describe the very spot in which Polycarp was wont to sit and discourse, and his coming in and his going out, and the tenor of his life, and the figure of his body, and the discourses which he addressed to the multitude, and his narratives of the conversations which he had with John, and with others who had seen the LORD ; how he mentioned their particular expressions, and what things he had heard from them of the LORD, and of his miracles, and of his doctrine : all these things were told us by Polycarp in consistency with the holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Word of life : these things, then, through the mercy of God visiting me, I heard with seriousness ; I wrote them, not on paper, but on my heart, and ever since, through the grace of God, I retain a genuine remembrance of them."

We thus see from the testimony of Origen, Tertullian, and Irenæus, the last of whom was taught the Christian faith by a Bishop, who had himself conversed with an Apostle, that the declaration of the Nicene Creed, concerning the person of our LORD, is but the declaration of the Church universal in all preceding ages up to the very times of the Apostles themselves : did the testimony, therefore, of the Nicene fathers, when they assert that the faith, which they set forth, was ultimately derived from the LORD himself, through the Apostles, and handed down from them to their successors, need confirmation, this confirmation is the most ample and satisfactory.

We are then able to perceive the *sources* whence the articles contained in our larger Creed are derived ; not as is sometimes most erroneously supposed from the personal views of the members of the Nicene Council, for they do not presume to present their own opinions upon doctrinal subjects ; but the Creed they approved embodies the testimony of the universal Church to the Christian verities, which had been transmitted to them through the Apostles, from our Lord himself. The substance of this Creed originated then with men who had received their knowledge of Christianity from the inspired Apostles themselves ; and consequently the origin of the Nicene symbol is to be referred to the earliest ages of the Christian Church, inasmuch as it contains the faith of such servants

of Christ as the martyr Polycarp, who was himself instructed by that disciple whom our LORD especially loved.

Having dwelt so much at length upon the origin of our larger Creed, we shall be obliged to say but few words on the origin of the *Creed, called the Apostles'*, which was the Creed of the Western, as was the Nicene of the Eastern Church.

Two or three facts will place the early origin of the Apostles' Creed in the true light.

Rufinus, a Presbyter of the Church in Aquileia, a city of ancient Venice, who flourished in the fourth century, not only gives us the Creed itself, but he also wrote a commentary on it: a fact which proves that the Creed was in existence and in use a long time previous to his day.

We have already seen that several Creeds existed at a much earlier period than the age of Rufinus; Tertullian, for example, who flourished about the year 200, having left us a Creed, which he declares "had been received as a rule of faith in the Church from the beginning of the gospel;" Irenæus also, who lived in the second century, furnishing a Creed, which, he says, "the Church throughout the world has received from the Apostles and their disciples; so that from such documentary evidence we may conclude, that the Creed called the Apostles', was also in existence certainly as early as the latter part of the second century.

The remarkable simplicity of the Apostles' Creed is a strong argument for its great antiquity. Both in the Greek and Latin Churches we have series of Creeds running through a succession of centuries, and in these series this fact is very apparent. The earlier the Creed, the greater its simplicity; and for this reason, that as errors multiplied, it became necessary to guard the truth by additional explanations. But of all the Creeds extant, none is so simple in its language and structure, as that called the Apostles'; and hence the inference, that it must have originated at a very early period, perhaps in the days of the Apostles themselves.

The striking similarity among all the primitive Creeds proves, that they must have had a common original, and that this original must have had a very early existence. As we write, we have before us not less than twenty-four different Creeds, not one of which is older than the fifth century, and yet, though they are so many and expressive of the faith of Churches scattered throughout the Christian world, they are in doctrine, and almost in language, strictly identical. How can we account for this wonderful similarity, but by allowing that they had a common origin, and this at a time when Christianity was in the infancy of its progress.

The tradition, which prevailed in the Primitive Church, that the Creed was in existence in the times of the Apostles is not to be overlooked, when we are endeavoring to determine the probable antiquity of this symbol. This tradition is embodied in a reputed Epistle of Clement, Bishop of Rome, to the Apostle James; and were this Epistle genuine, there could be no question as to the origin of the Apostles' Creed, since this letter expressly attributes it to them, and certainly such a man as the real Clement must have known. But as it is now universally conceded, that he is not the author of this Epistle, but that it is the production of some unknown writer of the third century, it is only valuable, as exhibiting the opinions generally entertained at that period, concerning the Creed. But what is this tradition? "CHRIST being risen, and ascended into heaven, the Holy Ghost being sent, and the knowledge of tongues conferred on the Apostles as yet remaining together, every man declaring what he understood, they framed the Creed which the faithful Church now holds, in order that as they were about to depart from each other, they might preach this rule through all nations."

From these several considerations we may conclude that our shorter Creed is the work, if not indeed of the Apostles themselves, certainly of Apostolical men, that is, of men who had conversed with the Apostles; and we may therefore safely rest in the opinion concerning it expressed by the celebrated Calvin: "The ancient writers ascribe the Creed to the Apostles, either from a belief, that it was written and published by their common concurrence, or from an opinion, that this compendium, being faithfully collected from the doctrines delivered by them, was worthy of being sanctioned by such a title; and whoever was its author, I have no doubt that it has been publicly and universally received, as a confession of faith, from the first origin of the Church, and even from the days of the Apostles; nor is it probable, that it was composed by any private individual, since from time immemorial, it has evidently been esteemed, as of sacred authority, by all the pious."

The Creed called the Apostles', the Creed called the Nicene, and the other Primitive Creeds, are evidently amplifications of the baptismal formula given by our LORD to his Apostles, "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptising in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" for each early Creed is divided into three parts; the first, teaching us to believe in "God the Father, who hath made us and all the world; and next, in God the Son, who hath redeemed us and all mankind; and the last in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies us and all the people of God."

Our blessed LORD had said, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" and in the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch by Philip the deacon, we perceive that a profession of faith, was, at this early period of the Christian Church required of candidates for this holy sacrament." As they went on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the Eunuch said, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? and Philip said, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*; and he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*; and he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him;" doubtless using the identical words which our Savior had prescribed to be employed in the administration of this initiatory sacrament. Here, then, is the tripartite formula, and in connection with it a profession of faith in the Son of God, the fragment at least of a Creed; and hence, beyond all question, we also have before us the vestiges of the "custom observed" in the time of Rufinus, which he calls "ancient," and which he thus describes: "They who are about to receive the grace of baptism, publicly repeat the Symbol in the hearing of the faithful." Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, of the same century with Rufinus, furnishes us with a more minute description of this "ancient custom observed" so universally at that time. "Thou wast asked, *Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty*? Thou saidst, *I do believe*; and thou wast immersed, that is, thou wast buried. Again, thou wast asked, *Dost thou believe in our LORD JESUS CHRIST and in his cross*? Thou saidst, *I do believe*; and thou wast buried with CHRIST. The third time thou wast asked, *Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost*? Thou saidst, *I do believe*; and the third time wast thou immersed, that *thy trine confession* might absolve thee from the many falls of thy former life;" Ambrose thus disclosing the "trine confession, or a Creed of three parts, corresponding in these respects both to the Apostles' Creed, and also to the threefold division of our Savior's words, when he commanded his ministers to "baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

We will now quote a single passage from Tertullian, and then it seems to us, we shall have fully opened to our view the very fountain head whence the Creed had its beginning. Speaking of baptism, this early father thus testifies: "We are then thrice merged; *answering something more than was appointed by the LORD in the Gospel*." These words deserve to be pondered. *Answering something more than was appointed*

by the LORD: *amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit.* "Answering something that was appointed by the LORD." Candidates for baptism in the year of our LORD 200, *answered something which he had appointed*; were required to make responsions of his appointment. What were these? What, but the very answers to the inquiries addressed to candidates, which we have just seen in the writings of Ambrose? Our LORD appointed answers to be returned by candidates for baptism; and these answers constituted the outlines, the frame-work of the Creed, and this frame-work, when filled up by additional particulars relating to each person of the sacred Trinity, constituted the Creed itself; for we must not fail to notice that Tertullian here assures us, that believers answered at their baptism not only the words the LORD had appointed, but likewise "*something more*;" something in the way of enlargement; just the enlargement, which the Creed presents; inasmuch as we are told by Rufinus, that all "who were about to receive the grace of baptism repeated the Symbol in the hearing of the faithful." The Creed, then, is but an amplification of the formula our LORD commanded to be used in baptism, and in its frame-work, at least, is co-existent with the earliest administration of this holy sacrament.

II. Having thus ascertained the sources whence our Creeds are derived, we will now mention some of THE IMPORTANT PURPOSES WHICH THESE CREEDS SUBSERVE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The Creeds, into the origin of which we have been examining, were, as we have seen, at first repeated by believers at the time of their baptism; but at the close of the fourth century, the custom of publicly reciting them, whenever divine service was performed, was introduced by the Bishops of Antioch; others soon saw the utility of this practice, and hence it was speedily adopted by all the Churches.

1. The first purpose these Primitive Creeds subserve is this: They show in what way the various subjects contained in them were understood by men who had conversed with the Apostles, and with others who had seen the LORD; and consequently exhibit the faith of the Christian Church in its earliest and purest state. This faith, from the circumstances of the case, could not have changed from the faith of the Apostles themselves; for Dr. Priestly justly remarks: "Their immediate disciples would receive and maintain the same doctrine that they held, and it must have been some time before any other could have been introduced, and have spread to any extent; and especially, before it could have become the pre-

vailing opinion;" therefore upon these Creeds we may confidently rely as formularies truly embodying the faith *at the first* "delivered to the saints;" the faith concerning the Trinity of persons in one Godhead; the person and offices of the incarnate Son of the Father; his second advent; a material resurrection and a future judgment; the immortality of the soul; the nature and office of the Holy Ghost; the existence of the Christian Church; the design of baptism; and the means of forgiveness and everlasting life.

2. By these summaries of revealed truth, moreover, the objects of faith can be easily comprehended by the mind, engraven upon the memory, and impressed upon the heart; so that these Creeds are admirably adapted to our mental and moral capacity; for they enable us to embrace in a brief space the whole system of truth God has been pleased to disclose to this sinful and wretched world. It was in this light that this subject was seen by Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth century. "To the end that no soul should perish in ignorance, we comprehend the whole substance of the faith in a few sentences. As a seed of mustard embraces many branches in a small grain, so this Creed encloses as in its bosom all the knowledge of piety, contained both in the Old and in the New Testament."

3. But these Creeds serve still another very valuable purpose: *they are bulwarks against the invasion of error*; for they are standards, by which we can try the truth or the falsehood of opinions, which are successively pressed upon us for our adoption. If these opinions, whether in the form of Decrees, Creeds, Confessions, Platforms, or judgments of individuals, be contrary to these Primitive Symbols, we may conclude they are erroneous. Not that these early Creeds, in themselves, make an opinion either true or false, but since they are witnesses to what was received as revealed truth in the times immediately succeeding the Apostles, their testimony must be regarded as infallible. The holy Scriptures are indeed the only *authority* in matters of faith, but these Apostolical Creeds are invaluable *witnesses* to what was the faith published to the world by men who were themselves taught the gospel by those who had received the personal instructions of our LORD and SAVIOR JESUS CHRIST; and what was exclusively the true faith *then*, can not but be exclusively, so far as these Creeds comprehend the Scripture doctrine, the true faith *now*. "Every descent," remarks Tertullian most truly, "must necessarily deduce itself from its first original. If these things are true, it is plain, that every doctrine which these Apostol-

ical, these original and mother Churches, held as analogous to the rule of faith, is to be owned as true, and as containing, without doubt, what the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from CHRIST, and CHRIST from God; but that all other doctrine is to be looked upon as false, and no ways savoring of those truths which have been delivered by the Churches, and the Apostles, and God."

4. As fixed and undeviating centers of doctrinal union, the Creeds might be rendered most eminently useful. Indeed, it was for the preservation and perpetuation of "the unity of the faith," that these primitive symbols were originally framed; and when they shall once more be permitted to subserve their destined purpose, repulsive divisions and hostile discussions among Christians will greatly diminish, if not altogether cease; for believers in the Son of God would again be, as they were old, "of one heart and one soul." This original unity of sentiment and feeling, has been sadly disturbed and broken by the subsequent introduction of other so called standards of revealed truth, which are as unnecessary and as pernicious in the Church, as the establishment of another sun would be in our planetary system. Such a rival body would obscure the radiance of the legitimate luminary, and distract and obstruct the motions of the attendant planets. Similar effects have arisen from the adoption of other Creeds than those which were in the first ages of the Gospel, constituted the centers and keepers of the true faith; their unerring light has been obscured, the primitive unity has been discarded, the body of "CHRIST is divided," and the spontaneous yearnings of renewed hearts after sympathy and fellowship, have given place to mutual alienation, dislike and contention. When the Christian revelation had been completed for fifteen centuries, the Church of Rome presumed to add to the original symbols some dozen articles, which are not only repugnant to the canonical Scriptures, but were utterly unknown in the first centuries of the Gospel; thus foisting into the Christian Church extraneous and strange materials, which inevitably produce confusion, discord, and every evil work. This bad example has been too extensively imitated by other bodies of Christians, till, were it not for the uncorrupted branches of the true Catholic Church, still sustaining and extending themselves from the primitive stock planted in England, in those early days, when the faith of Christendom was every where pure, we see not but that in Europe and America, the doctrinal unity of the Primitive Church would cease to exist, save as a record of remote history. It is true, we have our Thirty-

Nine Articles ; but we have them, not so much from choice, as from necessity ; we have them, as an invaded country has its fortresses and towers, as means of defense and protection. When Rome will spit her cannon, we will demolish our bulwarks ; when she will renounce her Tridentine Decrees and her novel and anathematizing Creeds, it will no longer be necessary for us to *protest* against her antichristian errors and usurpations. But this lamentable and desolating state of things does not change the purpose for which the early Creeds were formed, but only renders the necessity of carrying out this conservative design the more conspicuous and urgent. We hear much said of Christian unity, and yet we can not discover how this most desirable blessing is ever to be realized, till, "through the mighty power of the HOLY GHOST," all the deserters shall renounce all modern inventions, and return heartily and without reserve to the primitive platform.

5. But especially is the public repetition of these primitive Creeds a very important religious act ; for this repetition is an exercise of faith in the FATHER, who created, in the SON, who redeemed, and in the HOLY SPIRIT, who sanctifies us. In this light, *the place* the Creeds occupy in our devotional services, is not unworthy of attention.

The repetition of the Creeds, *follows* the reading of the Scripture lessons, in which is exhibited what God has done for the salvation of our souls, through the gift of his Son, and the mission of his Holy Spirit ; all important is it then, that we declare our faith in what he has revealed in his Holy Word, since, without faith, the Word of God can not profit us.

The rehearsal of the Creeds *precedes* the oblation of our prayers. But "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them who diligently seek him," and "how shall we call on him in whom we have not believed ?" "Faith," saith Augustine, "is the fountain of prayer ;" how necessary then, that we excite our souls to the liveliest exercise of faith, when we are about to call upon God the Father, through the mediation of the Son, for the gift of the Holy Spirit !

We would, then, in conclusion, say to all who may give these lines a perusal, hold fast these forms of sound words, which God in his merciful providence has delivered you. Hold them fast, to the exclusion of all diverse doctrinal standards of subsequent invention. Hold them fast in faith and in love. Believe them firmly ; love them fervently ; spread them widely ; continue grounded and settled in the faith they teach, and be not carried about by every wind of new doc-

trine ; for in those Creeds ye know, not only *whom*, but *what* ye have believed. It is not a matter of indifference what religious faith we embrace. A correct faith is closely connected with a correct practice. Our religious faith is the foundation of our religious principles ; and our lives will never be better than the maxims we adopt. A correct faith is also vitally connected with the divine life in our souls, and with our victory over this sinful world. "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even *our faith*. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is *the Son of God*." But above all, take care that your hearts accompany your lips, whenever you repeat these primitive standards of faith, since it is only "with the *heart* that man believeth unto righteousness. If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the LORD JESUS, and shalt believe in thy *heart*, that God hath raised him from the dead, *thou shalt be saved*."

ART. III.—PRIMATES OF ALL ENGLAND. (CONTINUED)

For twenty years after the imprisonment of Laud, a cloud hung over the Archiepiscopal edifice. Croydon was rented by the Parliament, first to the Earl of Nottingham, and then to Sir William Brereton, one of their Colonels, who converted the Chapel into a kitchen. The palace of Lambeth was sold to Colonel Scot; the Great Hall was pulled down; the bones of Archbishop Parker were cast out from their resting place, and his monument was demolished. In the Cathedral of Canterbury, the liturgy of Cranmer ceased to be heard; and in 1647, the old recollections of the people exhibited themselves in a tumultuous demand to be permitted to keep Christmas, which almost caused a Kentish insurrection. At one time, the nave was for a time converted into barracks, where the soldiers of Cromwell might set up their banners.

The Restoration came; and the Canterbury bells rang out their welcome to the returning sovereign. Juxon was yet alive; the dear friend of Laud, and his successor at St. John's College and at London; the Prelate who had been with Charles the First in his last hours and on the scaffold, and had received his dying charge; a man upon whose purity neither political nor religious bigotry had found a stain; whose mild goodness had been acknowledged, revered and spared in the darkest adversity of the Church, and might now, in the morning of its reviving prosperity, be a conciliating and reuniting standard. But he was already at the age of seventy-eight, and sorely afflicted with the stone, the painful disease of aged divines in those days; and when he came up to London, from his estate in Gloucestershire, called as he was to the Primacy, he was brought in a litter.

Archbishop Juxon presided at the coronation and the marriage of Charles the Second, and at the consecration of one or two Bishops, although trembling under the burden of age and weakness. His hopes for the Church and the realm were mournfully broken, when he had conversed with that faithless, dissolute son of a religious and princely father, whose image he had so fervently cherished. The King listened to him with tokens of respect; but his opinion was little regarded, and the arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs was left to the younger and more energetic Sheldon of London. It was not the wish of Juxon that the execution of the Act of Uniformity should be delayed; but in 1662, at fourscore, he published some considerations upon the Act, with "an Expedient for the

Satisfaction of the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, by a servant of the God of Peace." For the library at Lambeth he recovered the books of Archbishop Bancroft; he rebuilt the hall, at an expense of more than ten thousand pounds; repaired the Archiepiscopal residence at Croydon; and by his will gave seven thousand pounds to his College, two thousand towards the repairs of St. Paul's, five hundred to his own Cathedral, and seven hundred to the poor. So, after three years of dignity, and of infirmities, patiently and cheerfully borne, he entered into his rest, and was buried with much pomp, at Oxford, in the same grave with his predecessors. His nephew and representative, Sir William Juxon, was the first of a family of Barons.

Sheldon succeeded; the fifth Primate in an uninterrupted order, who had been elevated from the See of London. During the life of Juxon, he had already governed the Province, by virtue of his station, and of that character which led Sir Francis Wenman to say of him before the civil wars, that "Doctor Sheldon was born and bred to be Archbishop of Canterbury." The ejection of the non-conforming ministers was complete before his translation; but, although he spoke seldom in the Council, he obtained and defended the acts, which, in 1665, were passed, still further to restrain their movements. He requested by circulars, an account of their mode of living and of their conventicles, and procured a proclamation for the execution of the Statutes. The silenced ministers acknowledged his suavity of manner, but bemoaned the severity which hemmed them within the narrowest limits. It was easier for him to intercede that Sharp might be made Chancellor of Scotland, than to favor much the strictness of Leighton. But when the plague was driving away the clergy of the Metropolis, he remained at Lambeth, and gathering sums from the provinces through the other Prelates, he distributed much in charity to the crowd of sufferers. He was Chancellor of the University of Oxford; and the noble theater in which its solemnities are held, was his gift; but he had never the curiosity to see it, either during its erection, or after it was opened.

While his friend, Lord Clarendon, was at the head of the state, Sheldon had great power with King Charles the Second, who honored his wisdom and honesty. But when the King informed him that he had taken the seals from Clarendon, and bade him declare himself, he answered abruptly, "Sir, I wish that you would put away that woman," meaning the Duchess of Cleveland. The reproof was Episcopal; but the unprin-

cipled monarch, satisfied, as is the custom of such men, with detecting or imagining a weakness in the reprover, only asked why he had not spoken sooner. He never revered a person whom he could not much value. When Anne, Duchess of York, the daughter of Clarendon, consulted him before her union with the Roman Church, he told her that confession was agreeable to the command of God, and might well have been retained in the Church, and that he himself prayed for the departed. It was not a firm, deep piety of heart which the public voice ascribed to Sheldon, so much as great prudence in government, and an obliging deportment. But his was a large and generous hand; for after his elevation to the Mitre, he expended in public, pious and charitable uses, about seventy thousand pounds. He also increased the library at Lambeth by a legacy. His Primacy began when he was sixty-five, and ended on Friday, the ninth of November, 1677, when he had reached the age of seventy-nine. He lies buried at Croydon, beneath the most imposing of the Archiepiscopal monuments, and his epitaph beginning with the fit motto, "*fortiter et suaviter*," calls him "equal to all affairs, superior to all titles."

When Sheldon died, the Court had a peculiar interest in the selection of the new Primate. The Duke of York, next heir to the throne, had avowed himself a member of the Romish communion. So strong were the apprehensions of the nation, that a bill for his exclusion from the succession actually passed the House of Commons. It is more than probable that the King himself was already reconciled in heart, if not in fact, to the Papacy. Much might depend at a future day on the character and principles of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Compton, the Bishop of London, had been in the army till the Restoration, and was still very young in the Episcopate; but was besides one of those who would have sounded an early alarm, when the cause of the Reformation should even seem to be menaced. The Court desired a Primate less quick to suspect an assault from that side; trained in the school and temper of passive obedience; indisposed to controversy; and favoring by his life the ascetic form of piety, which is boasted by the Church of Rome. Such an one was found, not in the Bishop who sat at St. Paul's, but in the Dean, William Sancroft. All the earlier part of his manhood had been spent at Emanuel College, Cambridge, till, under the Commonwealth, he was expelled from his Fellowship for his loyalty. It was believed that two anonymous satires on the doctrine and practice of the prevailing sects of that period were

from his pen ; the "Predestinated Thief," and "Modern Policies." For some time he traveled in France and Italy ; and returning at the Restoration, preached a quaint sermon at the Consecration of seven Bishops ; one of whom, Cosin of Durham, made him his Chaplain and confidential friend. In the revision of the Common Prayer, his aid was employed ; and he prepared forms of service for the anniversaries of the martyrdom of King Charles the First, and of the Restoration, to which others of a more moderate tone were preferred, but which he published after his elevation to the Primacy. The final supervision of the press was committed to him ; and his accuracy and knowledge were useful in the arrangement of the Calendar and the Rubrics ; into which he would gladly have infused more of the Laudean peculiarities. The friendship of Cosin gave him the living of Houghton, and paved his way to the Deanery of York, which he soon exchanged for that of St. Paul's, in time to witness the fire of London, and the destruction of his own Cathedral. On him it devolved to lead the way, when it should rise from its ashes ; and he determined, as far as lay with him, that it should rise nobly. His own subscription was fourteen hundred pounds, besides which, he rebuilt the Deanery. He had now seen the foundations of the Cathedral laid ; when, at the age of sixty, he was bidden to go up higher.

The Primacy of Sancroft extended through thirteen years of contention and of peril. Grave, solemn, strict, reserved and cold, he presided with regularity and precision. No thought of abandoning the threatened ark of the Protestant Church of England found entrance into his mind ; he would have suffered calmly for its sake ; but advancing years made him less active, and he was fettered by the doctrine of absolute allegiance. He even proposed, in 1687, that the Clergy should be obliged to read the Declaration of King Charles, after the dissolution of that Parliament at Oxford, in which the Commons had a second time rejected his brother. But he waited on the Duke of York, and entreated him to return to the Church which he had forsaken. At the deathbed of Charles, he employed great freedom of speech, but was unanswered. To the tyrannous encroachments of King James, he opposed a conscientious, but a wavering resistance. Placed at the head of the Ecclesiastical Commission, he remained absent, and prepared a protest against its jurisdiction. When a Papist was proposed as one of the Charter House pensioners, and the King would have dispensed with the Statutes, he presided at a meeting of the Governors, which rejected the

royal order; and from that time he was forbidden to appear at the Court. Evelyn would have had his advice on the question of duty, whether he should put the privy seal to the license of the Popish books of Obadiah Walker; but he simply counselled him to follow his conscience. He promised Bishop Loyd of St. Asaph, that he would not consecrate Parker and Cartwright till the articles exhibited against them should have been examined; but, notwithstanding, performed the Consecration. In 1688, alarmed and aroused, he issued a monition to the Bishops of his province, calling on them to recommend earnestly to their Clergy the diligent and exemplary fulfillment of their functions: the instruction of the people in opposition to the dream of Papal jurisdiction, and a wise and very tender regard to the Protestant Dissenters. At the head of the seven Prelates who went to the Tower for the liberty of the Church, he was sure of the ground on which he stood; but when the question of revolution could not be shunned, his view of the duty of subjects continually shook and embarrassed his conduct. He was present at the meeting which invited the Prince and Princess of Orange to cross the Channel; and yet he came not to see them on their arrival, nor attended the Coronation. When they had been proclaimed, his Chaplain, Wharton, inquired whether he should name them in the prayers. The Archbishop replied, that he would give him no further orders; but when Wharton had named them, reproved him very angrily. At length, he was compelled to receive or reject the Oath of Allegiance; and, after fasting and prayer, he adhered to his ancient principles, and ceased to be recognized as Primate. But he lingered at Lambeth four months after his deposition, and was only removed at last by a judgment of the Court of Exchequer. He also refused to see his successor. From Lambeth, thus expelled, he withdrew to the Temple; and then, to Fresingfield, in Suffolk, his birthplace, where his family had dwelt on a small estate for several centuries. He now suffered his beard to grow, but passed his retirement in cheerfulness, and not without occupation, for he was a laborious student, and had made large collections of documents. After two such years, at the age of seventy-six, he lay down upon the bed from which he was to rise no more, humbly submitting himself with the words of godly contrition, imploring forgiveness for his enemies, praying to the last for the family of King James, and their restoration, but saying to one of his Chaplains who had taken the Oaths, "I trust heaven's gate is wide enough to receive us both." Just before he breathed his last, he asked for the

Prayer Book, and opening to the Commendatory Prayer for a person at the point of departure, ordered it to be read; and then died a little after midnight. He was interred very privately at Frasingfield, where, as at Harleston, he had established schools, and had enlarged the income of the Vicar. His library, three advowsons, and other donations, passed to Emanuel College; and he gave a thousand pounds towards Chelsea College, and left a large property to his nephew. He had written his own epitaph, in which he alludes to the suddenness of the second advent, and the nakedness with which he must return to the dust from which he came.

The eyes of men had been fixed on John Tillotson, long the Dean of Canterbury, so soon as it was perceived that the Archbishop must retire. Tillotson was of a Puritan family in Yorkshire, and his education at Cambridge fell within the period when the Covenant and the Engagement were triumphant. He listened to all, and displeased by the rudeness and fanaticism of the times, glided into a kind of mild eclecticism, in which the Puritan doctrine was softened, the Christian life became more prominent, and a broad charity embraced all Protestant communions. In the last years of the Commonwealth, he was a Fellow of Clare Hall, and at one time resided in the family of the Attorney General, Prideaux. At the Restoration, he at once conformed, having no hesitation in conscience, and preferring the government and doctrine of the Church; but he never lost his kindness for the dissenters. He was ordained by a Scottish Prelate, Sydsersf, Bishop of Gallo-way; and becoming Rector of Kidding-ton, in Suffolk, was assailed by the complaints of his parishioners, who placed his more practical instruction in contrast with the Calvinism of the independent ministers, and said that the Gospel was not preached among them. But the eminent powers, which afterwards made him the first preacher of his age, now called him to the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn; where the learned and the distinguished heard with delight his flowing eloquence, his clear, good sense, his candid arguments from the Scriptures, his lucid display of the principles of natural as well as revealed religion, and his vigorous attacks on Romanism, the great foe against which, during his future life, he was destined to wage a perpetual war. He married the niece of Cromwell and step-daughter of Bishop Wilkins, at whose consecration he preached, and who died beneath his roof; and into his hands came the papers of Wilkins, as well as of Barrow. Indeed, he was the editor of the great work of Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope; and of his other writings, his own first

publication was on the Rule of Faith, in opposition to Sargeant, a Romish controversialist. For many years he was lecturer at St. Lawrence, Jewry. In 1672, he had already printed some of his sermons, and when the Court had declared itself in favor of liberty of conscience, he was made Dean of Canterbury; and in that office disclosed his characteristic disinterestedness, independence, and benevolence. He refused to bestow Prebends prospectively; and when Beveridge, who was one of the Prebendaries, suggested a question, whether the Rubrics permitted that a King's letter should be read, recommending a collection for the persecuted Protestants of France, "Doctor," said Tillotson, "charity is above Rubrics." Bates, Howe, and even the Socinian Firmin, were his friends, as well as the rigid Churchman, Nelson. He so offended the Duke of York, by a sermon at Whitehall, on the difficulties of salvation in the Church of Rome, that the Duke came no more to the service. But the esteem and love of the metropolis attended him; and many dissenters were won to the Church by his mildness and his reasons. At the funerals of Gouge and Whichcot, he was the preacher. He preached before the Commons during the excitement of the Popish Plot; and refused, in 1681, to sign the Address of the London Clergy, on the declaration of King Charles that he would not assent to a bill of exclusion. Lord Russell called him to his side in prison, and when he was to mount the scaffold; and Tillotson even strove to win for him an acknowledgment of the unlawfulness of resistance to authority. Afterwards he was the honored correspondent of Lady Russell; and in the higher walks of his acquaintance, he made many earnest appeals to the conscience of the irreligious. Against the infidelity and the Romanism which threatened England, he stood forth in the pulpit a foremost champion in evil times; and at the Revolution, he was at once appointed Clerk of the Court to King William; he exchanged his Deanery for that of St. Paul's, though at some pecuniary sacrifice; and in the interval between the change of government and the deprivation of the nonjuring prelates, he was busily employed in presenting the scheme of comprehension. So far was he willing to advance, as to receive ministers of the foreign reformed communions without re-ordination, and ministers who had been ordained by Presbyters in England, after they should have been hypothetically ordained by a Bishop. At the convocation of 1689, he was the royal, but the unsuccessful candidate for the office of Prolocutor; for many of the clergy were jealous of the moderation of his principles; and there was indeed in the

mind of Tillotson, a certain latitudinarianism, which, though exaggerated by his adversaries, is yet a most serious blemish in the features of a character, otherwise so admirable and blameless. He was consecrated on Whit Sunday, 1691, by Bishop Mew, having spent the day before in fasting and prayer. Sancroft had not yet left Lambeth, and Tillotson remained at his Deanery till November, repairing Lambeth in the mean time, and building a large apartment for his wife, for he was the first married primate since Parker, a period embracing a hundred and fifteen years, and eight Archbishops. He was now sixty-one; had lost his children; and had already suffered from a slight apoplectic visitation. One day, a packet was sent to him, enclosing a mask. On a large bundle of papers he wrote, "these are libels; may God forgive their authors; I do." Encouraged, however, by the countenance and perfect reverence of the King and Queen, and by the popular esteem, he formed plans of extensive good, which he was not spared to complete. The abuse which charged him with favoring Socinianism, constrained him to publish a volume of masterly sermons, which he had preached in 1679, on the Divinity and Incarnation of the REDEEMER. His last discourse was preached at Whitehall, on evil speaking. His last labor was a revision of the Treatise of Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, which had been prepared at his suggestion and that of Queen Mary; and just a month before his death, he returned it with a letter, in which he freely said of the Creed of Athanasius: "I wish we were well rid of it." On Sunday, the eighteenth of November, 1694, he was seized with a sudden illness at the Chapel at Whitehall, during the service. It increased, and became a palsy. He could scarcely speak; but it seemed that his mind was clear, and he said in broken words, that he thanked God he was quiet within, and had nothing to do but to wait the will of heaven. On the fifth day, about sunset, he expired in the arms of Nelson. His funeral sermon was preached by Burnet; and his body was interred at St. Lawrence, Jewry, the old Church of Bishop Wilkins, and his own. While yet a private clergyman, he had devoted two tenths of his income to charitable ends; during his Primacy he had maintained a generous hospitality; and he died poor, leaving to his widow only the copyright of his sermons, which yielded several thousand guineas, and the cordial esteem of King William, who gave her a pension. Through the eighteenth century, the style and spirit, the good sense and benevolence, the doctrines, and even the doubts of Tillotson, were impressed on English Theology.

William and Mary promoted certainly the more moderate divines; but it is not less certain that among these they sought the most exemplary and practical; and that the episcopate was never more revered than while it was filled by the men of their choice. Discretion, mildness, and a very shining example of pastoral diligence, were the traits which recommended Bishop Tenison, of Lincoln, for the vacant Primacy. The first act was one of the saddest; for his patroness, the virtuous Queen, followed Tillotson, whom she so much loved and resembled, within little more than a month, to the world of spirits. Tenison administered to her the sacrament and the last consolations, and preached her funeral sermon with the warmth of affectionate gratitude. While the heart of William was softened by his bereavement, the Archbishop spoke so plainly of his indulgences, that the King promised him to see Lady Villiers no more. During the whole remainder of his reign, Tenison was one of the few who were admitted to his intimate confidence and society; and he was with him in his last moments. Archbishop Tenison was fifty-eight years old, when he came to reside at Lambeth. He had been preferred to Stillingfleet, because he possessed more vigorous health; and indeed his very tall frame was not much bent, nor his fair complexion robbed of its hue, till he had passed seventy-nine. The reverence of the public, and especially of the Whig party, for his person, was expressed by Garth:

" Good Tenison's celestial piety
At last has raised him to the sacred See ;"

while Swift, the most ill-natured of Tories, could only say that he was "the most good-for-nothing Prelate, and the dullest man, he ever knew;" abuse, such as Swift would have poured on none but a man of modesty and moderation. Intent on the real, inward improvement of the Church, he sent, in 1699, circular letters to the Bishops of his Province, recommending frequent meetings of the Clergy of each neighborhood, with other measures for their own benefit and the reformation of their parishioners. But when Queen Anne was upon the throne, in an age of letters and of martial glory, Tenison presided over a Church in agitation and a divided clergy. He saw indeed, and doubtless counselled, or aided, two great designs which adorned the religion of that reign; the gift of the revenue drawn by the Crown from the tenths and first fruits, for the augmentation of poor livings, and the erection of fifty new Churches in the metropolis. But a controversy between the authority of the Bishops, most all of whom were of these mode-

rate principles, which brought them the name of Low Churchmen, and the claims of the Lower House of Convocation, in which a majority were High Churchmen, was continued through the whole reign, and most of the Kingdom. William had given a commission to Tenison, Lloyd, Burnet, Patrick, and More, to nominate fit persons for every Ecclesiastical station in the royal gift, which should become vacant; but it was not renewed by Anne, who wavered between her own private attachment to the High Church party, and the necessity of sustaining the other, because her title to the throne would be hazarded by the overthrow of its principles. As became his station, Tenison watched that the interests of the Church should not suffer in the union with Scotland, and he preserved a dignified calmness through all the storms of parties. His own vote in the House of Lords was given against the bill which would have forbidden what was called Occasional Conformity; and which was at length, after several years and attempts, passed by agreement. The power of adjourning both Houses of Convocation resided in the Archbishop, if the practice of past Convocations were followed. But the Lower House now asserted a right of proroguing itself, and appointing its sessions; and the two bodies were engaged in an unbroken contest. The judgment of Archbishop Tenison was with the milder and more comprehensive system; and his way was calm and steady. He addressed the Convocation of 1705, at its dissolution, in words of sober reproof; he appealed, in 1707, to the Clergy of the Province, by a statement of the proceedings of their representations. In 1710, an attack of gout compelled him to be absent. A meeting of the Bishops at Lambeth, on Easter Tuesday, in 1712, concurred in asserting the validity of all baptism, performed in the name of the Trinity. Within those walls, too, were gathered at different times, as Chaplains of Archbishop Tenison, many of the most distinguished divines of the succeeding race; Potter, Hody, Ibbot, Smallbroke, Sydall, Gibson. He had no children, and in 1714 his wife was removed from his old age. It was permitted him to see the peaceful settlement of the line of Brunswick. In the April of the following year, he made his testament; and on the fourteenth of December, died at Lambeth. He bequeathed a thousand pounds to Queen Anne's bounty; five hundred to the widows and children of Clergymen; one hundred to Bromley College; one hundred to Protestant exiles from France; two advowsons and a thousand pounds to Bennet College, where he was educated; a piece of ground to the Parish of Lambeth for a burial-place; two hundred and

thirty pounds to the poor ; one hundred to Archbishop Whitgift's Hospital at Croydon ; one hundred to ten poor Clergymen of his Diocese. He had also built and enclosed a Charity School at Lambeth ; had founded one at Croydon, to which he bequeathed four hundred pounds ; had rebuilt the chancel of Topcroft Church, where his parents were buried ; had given two hundred and fifty pounds to the Library of St. Paul's ; had built the throne in the choir of Canterbury Cathedral ; and he presented at his death between two and three hundred manuscripts to the Library at Lambeth ; and closed his charities by bequeathing a thousand pounds towards the support of two Bishops in the American Colonies, whenever they should be sent. Archbishop Tenison was buried at Lambeth ; and let it be added in praise of one of the most exemplary of English prelates, that he recommended what the English Church so much sinned in neglecting so long, a general system of education.

The government of George the First could not hesitate in the choice of a successor. By far the most learned and the most revered man upon the bench, was Bishop Wake ; and he was the ablest, except one or two of those who were hostile or indifferent to the advancement of the House of Brunswick. At the same age with Tenison, Wake was raised to the See of Canterbury, and from the same Diocese of Lincoln. It was said of him by partisans, that his elevation seemed to have produced a revolution in his opinions. But they forgot that it befitted a Primate to subject more carefully his private feelings to the duty of an impartial governor ; and that, placed at the head of the Church, he must naturally have been more alive to the responsibility of admitting even a seeming source of peril. As Archbishop, he opposed the repeal of the Schism Act, and of the bill against Occasional Conformity, and offered also, what was called the bill for strengthening the Protestant Interest, and condemned the political attempts of Dissenters : while he declared that he had all imaginable tenderness for those among them, who were governed by their conscience, he freely avowed that the members of the Church were united to them by a common faith and common interests ; and pronounced it as having been always the opinion of the Church of England, that their baptism was not to be rejected. He sustained the petition of the London Clergy against the act which allowed the affirmation of Quakers in Courts of Law, and entered his protest on its passage.

The former residence of Archbishop Wake on the continent, with his warmth and largeness of spirit, had endeared to

him the interests of the foreign Churches, and made him familiar with the thought of a wider union. Under his Primacy, Lambeth was the center of a correspondence which extended at least to four important Communions. In the first year after his translation, he informed himself of the distresses and the history of the Moravian brethren, and recommended them to the King for relief, as a Reformed Church, possessing Episcopal succession. A suggestion and a message from the learned Dupin, was the occasion of many letters from the Archbishop to France, and of a plan, prepared by Dupin, for the union of the Anglican and Gallican Churches. But Wake insisted, as the foundation of all, that all things should be removed from the public offices of both, which would hinder a perfect communion in divine service. He thought that this would require, in the English liturgy, only the erasure of a single rubric relating to the Eucharist. Prompted chiefly by the hope, that the breach between Rome and the Church of France might at that critical period be widened and made perpetual, he conducted this delicate correspondence with a discretion and charity which could not well be surpassed, and paused exactly at the limits, which were imposed by the dignity of his own Primacy, and the doctrine of the Reformation. During the very same time, he wrote to Le Clerc, freely condemning some of his annotations, with their tone of rationalism, but acknowledging and embracing the Reformed Churches, and disclaiming the opinion of those furious writers, as he termed them, who would deny the validity of their Sacraments; he interceded in behalf of the Protestants of Hungary and Piedmont; he gave the wisest and kindest advice to the pastors and Professors of Geneva, to refrain from their minute and threatening discussions of the most difficult questions of theology, and to imitate the moderation of the English confessions; he wrote also to Turretin, and to Schurer of Berne, counselling a conciliatory treatment of the doctrinal differences in Berne and Lausanne; he answered to the inquiries of his old correspondent, Jablonski, advising no union between the Polish Lutherans and the Roman Catholics, except on entire equality, and with a common rejection of the authority of the Pontiff, and no sacrifice of truth even to peace; and he corresponded with the Protestants of the city of Nismes, and of the province of Lithuania. With even warmer zeal, he gave his blessing, his admiration and his aid, to Ziegenbalg and Grundler, the first of those Lutheran Missionaries, who, under the patronage of Denmark, or of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, preached the gospel on the shores of Malabar. His

elegant Latin seems to glow with primitive, even with Apostolic ardor, while, as the chief minister of the English Church, he stretches forth his hands in fellowship and benediction.

Lambeth and Croydon Palaces were repaired by Archbishop Wake, at a cost of eleven thousand pounds; and liberal and munificent were the expenditures and benefactions of the Archiepiscopal household. But his lot was cast in times of political corruption; and at the Court, as he grew older, he found little more than the forms of official reverence. It is said that at the first meeting of the Council, after the death of King George the First, he produced the will of that monarch, which had been placed in his hands, and gave it to the royal heir, who put it into his pocket, and never made it public. The disputes in the Convocation had been suppressed by the silent suppression of the Convocation itself, for all purposes beyond a few formalities. In the latter years of Wake, lies the origin of Methodism; but his infirmities had so prevailed, that probably it had little of his attention. It is singular, that having held the See of Lincoln like Tenison, and been translated at the same time of life, he sat at Canterbury the same number of years, and died at the same age of seventy-nine. He expired at Lambeth, in January, 1737, but was buried at Croydon. His books, coins and manuscripts were bequeathed to Christ Church, Oxford; and his large estate, which was reckoned at a hundred thousand pounds, was divided among his six daughters, all of whom were married, and one of whom, the wife of Doctor Lynch, saw her husband and her father holding their seats as Dean and Archbishop in the same Cathedral.

The next two Primates presided ten years only. Potter, the Bishop of Oxford, older in the Episcopate than Sherlock, abler than Gibson, less obnoxious than Hoadley, a Whig in politics, yet vindicated by his great work on Church Government from every possible charge of indifference to the ecclesiastical constitution of England, was, at the age of sixty-three, translated to Lambeth as Archbishop, where he had once resided as Chaplain to Tenison. One of his first acts was done in the spirit of his immediate predecessor. He wrote to Count Zinzendorf, congratulating him on his Consecration to the office of a Moravian Bishop, and declared himself satisfied of the Moravian succession. The founder of Methodism, too, has recorded the advice given him by "that great and good man," as he terms him; who at Oxford had declared his approbation of their charitable labors in the prisons, and who, after his elevation to the Metropolitan See, bade them

avoid exceptionable phrases, afford no needless umbrage, show lesser topics of contention, and keep to the doctrines of the Church, in which, he assured them, while he lived there should be no innovation. Against the grateful reverence of the Wesleys, must be poised the acrimony of Whiston, who accused him of pride, and adulation, and neglect of discipline; and wrote to his successor, complaining of the mean composition of the occasional forms of prayers which had been prescribed by Archbishop Potter. The testimony of John and Charles Wesley, will probably outweigh that of this eccentric and heretical theologian, who, when he charged the Primate with hostility to reformation, may have thus described an opposition to some of his own wild theories of primitive order. But while the vigilance and zeal of Potter have been praised, a common opinion undoubtedly painted him as morose and haughty. Warburton believed that he had encouraged the London Clergy in their denunciations of his Divine Legation of Moses, and expostulated; nor did he seem to credit the denial of the Primate; but Warburton was not accustomed to form wild judgments, and Potter shared his dislike and his blows with very worthy associates. Anecdotes, however, are told, which would hardly have been told of a Prelate whose kindness and meekness had been signally apparent. Thus, he is said to have been solicited in behalf of a distant relation, who had a curacy of eighteen pounds a year, and to have replied that he thought the young man was very well provided for. One would gladly hope that this was the same relative, of whom there is a less plausible story. It is said of this man, namely, that his kinsman, soon after he came to the Primacy, called upon him, with the intention of bestowing on him some preferment, but found him at an ale-house, playing at nine pins, and aiming at the center pin with the cry, "here goes for the head of the Church." The story adds that the Primate withdrew in disgust: and certainly this Clergyman was already preferred too far. However this were, the Archbishop had an estate of ninety thousand pounds; and he left it mostly to his younger son, the elder, it is said, having offended him by a marriage below his dignity. The younger wedded an heiress, and entered Parliament, where a few brilliant speeches raised high expectations of his fame; but he became worthless, was guilty of ill-treatment of his wife, and was supposed to have written the infamous "Essay on Woman," for publishing which, Wilkes was tried and convicted. His elder brother in the meanwhile, if disinherited, had abundant provision through his father, a living in Kent, the Arch-

deanery of Oxford, and afterwards the Deanery of Canterbury itself, for the age of family preferments among the pre-lacy had now begun. The three daughters were all married to Clergymen; one to the Archdeacon of Durham, Dr. Sayer; one to the Dean of Exeter, Dr. Milles; and one to the son of Bishop Tanner.

When the rebellion of 1745 threatened once more the safety of Protestant Britain, Potter had already found threescore and ten; but he exhorted the Clergy to lend their endeavors to the maintenance of the common liberties and religion. To the ministry of Walpole he seems to have given a dignified support. Having arrived at the age of seventy-three, he fell by a stroke of apoplexy, at Lambeth, on the 10th of October, in 1747, and was buried at Croydon, but has no monument, except his classical and theological writings. The latter were collected and published in three volumes, a few years after his decease.

Whatever faults men saw, or supposed, in the temper of Potter, none doubted the amiableness of his successor. After Butler had declined the Primacy, saying, in his glowing way, that it was too late to support a falling Church; and Sherlock from his health; Archbishop Herring was translated from York, reluctantly, but with the general approbation; for he was disliked by none, except it were for the gentleness of his principles. Since Tillotson, no primate has been so attractive a preacher as Herring; and he was the only unmarried primate since Sancroft. The palaces of Lambeth and Croydon were freely repaired in his time, and were the seats of a most courteous and conciliating hospitality. One curate, to whom the Archbishop had politely said that he should be happy to see him always at his table, came afterwards as a constant guest, till self-defense suggested a presentation to a distant living. The prerogative possessed by the primates, of conferring honorary degrees, was worthily exercised in favor of Warburton and Jortin, of Birch and Hawkesworth. It was now the period when the tendency to expatiate on the precepts of the Gospel, while its doctrines were spoken in the most general language, and almost as if with suspicion, had reached its height; and the example of the primate strengthened those who avoided controversy, and urged with clearness and warmth the duties of the Christian life. He was but fifty-four when he was translated to Canterbury; and after six years, he was visited with a violent fever, during which he lost eighty ounces of blood; and though he recovered, it was but to languish. He retired to Croydon, which he loved; for

he had an eye for rural scenes, and a heart for all gentle pleasures. There, however, in his great feebleness, he declined all public business as far as he could; and saw little company, except his particular friends and his relations. Count Zinzendorf wrote to him during his sickness, and offered him absolution, "notwithstanding," he said, "the great sin of omission;" an expression which the Archbishop understood not, till a friend explained that it was his celibacy. Towards the end of his life, he wrote, "I know who sent me hither; and how much it is my duty to attend his summons for a removal; but life is over with me." At length, on the thirteenth of March, 1757, he calmly breathed his last. He had bequeathed a large portion of his fortune to public charities, besides a liberal provision for his household. A thousand pounds were added to the funds of his College; and a thousand gladdened the hearts of the widows and orphans of Clergymen. He was buried privately in the Church of Croydon, as was fitting, since he had so much delighted in its retirement. Some years after, a volume of his sermons was published, and a collection of his letters to his friend, Mr. Duncombe.

His immediate successor never lived at either of the archiepiscopal residences. There was some question between him and the executors of Herring; and so Archbishop Hutton took a house at Westminster; and a year, a week and a day, after his predecessor died, his Primacy, the briefest since the Reformation, suddenly ended. They were born in the same year, and held successively the very same Sees, Bangor, York, and Canterbury; and although Herring was more eloquent and more eminent, more generous and more attractive, there was a considerable resemblance in the character of their administration. Hutton, too, had courteous and engaging manners, affability and cheerfulness, readiness and clearness in discourse, taste and eloquence of mind, and, though afflicted with bodily infirmities, a graceful and majestic person, which was well matched with his strong sense of ecclesiastical decorum. It is mentioned of him as a circumstance not without weight in the time in which he presided, that he seldom dined out on a Sunday. His death was on a Sunday evening, and was produced by an inflammation of the bowels, with which he had been seized the day before. As he had desired, he was buried privately at Lambeth; and his will was executed by his widow and his two daughters.

The Duke of Newcastle, then at the head of the ministry, without solicitation, and notwithstanding the aversion formerly displayed by the King for Secker, on account of his influence

with the Prince of Wales, yet bestowed the Primacy on one who was indisputably the worthiest man then seated in a bishopric, at least if the great age of Sherlock be excepted. A childless widower, and at sixty-five, Secker took possession of Lambeth, where afterwards he always lived: Miss Talbot, the daughter of his early friend, presided at his board; and the excellent Porteus was one of his chaplains. He repaired and much beautified the great Hall of the Palace; and the same diligence and method which had made him so efficient a Parish Priest and a Bishop, distinguished still the Primate. In two books, a black and a white, he kept a record of the favorable or unfavorable notices which he received concerning Clergymen; and so awarded his promotions. The settlement of the Episcopate in America had been among his dearest wishes; and he at once established a correspondence from Lambeth with Doctor Johnson, of Connecticut, afterwards of New York. While he answered, through the press, the violence of Mayhew of Boston, and replied with dignity and candor to the letters in which Whitefield complained of the American Clergy, he uttered to Johnson his earnest hope that they would cut off all occasion from them that sought occasion, by "preaching faithfully and frequently the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel," which, he said, had been too much neglected in England. He wished to preserve peace with the dissenters; but he deemed it inexpedient that even calumnies should remain unanswered. Almost at the end of his life, he vindicated the memory of his friend, Bishop Butler, from an anonymous charge of Romish propensities; while he freely avowed that in placing a cross in his chapel, he thought the Bishop had done amiss. Even Hervey, on his death-bed, said of the Archbishop of Canterbury, "I am told he has religion really at heart." He gave preferment to Jones of Nayland, and to Gloster Ridley; he patronized Mrs. Carter; and was acknowledged by the younger Berkeley as "a second father." The grateful Bishop Porteus, who was one of the editors of his writings, thus spoke of him from his heart: "as one to whose kindness I owe my first establishment and much of my success in life; to whose instructions, virtues, and example I am indebted for still more important benefits; with whose venerable name it is my highest worldly ambition to have my own united here, and with whom, among the spirits of just men made perfect, may a gracious God render me worthy to be more closely and permanently united hereafter." The Archbishop saw with joy the virtues and devout habits of the youthful sovereign, George the Third, whom he baptized,

crowned and married. While his strength endured, he rode much, and always ate and drank very moderately. His manners and tone in conversation were deliberate; and sayings of his are recorded, which mark that accurate knowledge of the human heart and conduct, that is seen in his sermons. "Madam," said he to a lady, "if you do not teach your children moral lessons, you may be sure the devil will." When some one questioned him respecting the custom of saying, "not at home," he replied that "the first man who said it told a lie." Large manuscript volumes of notes on several of the prophetic books, attested his laborious study of the Scriptures. He wished for a new version of the Psalms, and was an advocate for a revision of the authorized translation of the Bible. The critical works of Lowth, Blayney, and Herrick, were all indebted to his assistance, always granted with readiness to the pursuits of the learned and good; and in the strong contest between Lowth on one side, and Warburton and Hurd on the other, he had the reverence of both parties. The gout and stone were his worst enemies, and from them he suffered severely. On Sunday, the last day of July, 1768, while his servants were raising him in bed, he suddenly exclaimed that his thigh was broken. Strange as it seemed, it proved true; the bone had been almost destroyed by disease; a fever ensued; and he survived but three days. His friend, Mr. Talbot, of Redding, one of those Clergymen, who, at a later period, were designated as Evangelical, came in to visit him during his illness. The Archbishop begged him to pray with him; and as Mrs. Talbot looked around for a Prayer Book, he said, "kneel down by me, and pray as I know you are accustomed." He bequeathed the sum of thirteen thousand pounds to the widow and daughters of his elder friend, Talbot; and eleven thousand pounds to charitable uses; of which two thousand was assigned to the Society for the propagation of the Gospel, half of it for the support of Bishops in America; a thousand to the Society for promoting Christian knowledge; five hundred to Irish Schools; five hundred to the widows and children of poor Clergymen; five hundred to Bromley College; fifteen hundred to the Hospitals of Croydon, St. John's at Canterbury, and St. Nicholas at Harbledown; more than three thousand to several Hospitals of London and Lambeth; and two thousand for building or repairing parsonages on poor livings within his Diocese. The spot at which he was interred had been designated by himself. It was in the passage from the garden-door of his Palace to the north door of the Parish Church of Lambeth; and he forbade any epitaph or monu-

ment. But his Lectures on the Catechism, his Sermons and Charges, were his best legacy, and his most lasting memorial; and none will pass through the walks of Lambeth, and trace the tombs of its venerable masters, without remembering him of whom such a man as Bishop Lowth could say, that he was "the greatest, the best, and the most unexceptionable character that our ecclesiastical annals have to boast." His manuscripts enriched the Archiepiscopal Library; and he bequeathed it, all those among his books, which were not before in the collection.

Through the next fifteen years, Archbishop Cornwallis presided, the first Protestant Primate of noble lineage. He had from Parr, the praise of a "temperate and judicious Metropolitan;" and, though apparently much engaged in political affairs, yet in ecclesiastical business was attentive and punctual, and added the grace of affectionate and engaging manners. Higher praise of him is not recorded. Once a year, the antiquary, Pegge, to whom he had given preferment on the prospect of preferment at Lichfield, made him a visit of a fortnight or a month at the Palace. Here, the Archbishop, who kept a princely board, with great courtesy, had shaken off a relic of feudal times, by abolishing the separate table of the Chaplains, and admitting them to his own. It was the unhappiness of Cornwallis that, prompted or aided by an unwise wife, he brought archiepiscopal robes into contact with the fashions and follies of the world. Sad enough it was that Garrick, in 1777, should speak of being at Court, and "having such work made with him from the Page of the back stairs to the Archbishop of Canterbury," that he was suffocated with compliments. But yet more deplorable was that day when such a letter was needful, as that which King George the Third addressed to the Primate, in reproof of routs held by Mrs. Cornwallis within the very halls of Lambeth. Bishop Watson, in his rough phrase, probably explained the matter. He sent one of his political sermons to the Archbishop in 1780, accompanied by a rather surly letter. "I never afterwards," says Watson, "troubled myself with him; for I had no opinion of his abilities, and he was so wife-ridden, I had no opinion of his politics." Under an Act of Parliament, Croydon Palace was now sold for but two or three thousand pounds, that another seat might be purchased; afterwards it came, together with its banqueting hall, into the most ignoble uses. He gave many valuable books to the library at Lambeth in his lifetime. Archbishop Cornwallis died on the 19th of March, 1783, at the age of seventy. He had no children; but his

widow, who was his executrix, survived him almost through another generation.

When Bishop Moore, in 1774, was removed from the Deanery of Canterbury to the See of Bangor, an epigramatist in one of the magazines, represented Bangor as saying :

“ Cease, Canterbury, to deplore
The loss of your accomplished Moore,
Repining at my gain:
I soon may have most cause to mourn ;
To you he'll probably return,
With me will scarce remain.”

The prognostic proved the common opinion of his fitness for a station of the highest dignity, and it was now fulfilled ; but not till the Primacy had first been offered to Lowth and to Hurd, and declined by both ; by the former, probably from his infirmities ; by the latter, from his preference for greater retirement. Both, it is said, united in recommending the Bishop of Bangor. He was but fifty-one when he was translated, and his youngest son was the only child ever born to a Primate of England. Of his four sons, two became Prebendaries of his Cathedral, and a third obtained a seat in Parliament ; while his only two daughters were successively matched away, on arriving at the bright age of fifteen or sixteen. Within his family and in his official intercourse, he was amiable and beloved ; and he presided with that conciliating moderation which has so often preserved the archiepiscopal chair from reproach, even in the midst of great conflicts. It fell to his lot to obtain and execute a legal permission to consecrate Bishops from the United States of America. He declined proceeding on the first application, which was from Connecticut, in favor of Dr. Seabury, until the Parliament should have given its sanction, which was at that time withheld by the ministry. But, from the subsequent delays and careful inquiries of the English Prelacy, it is probable that he was not grieved at not possessing the power, before it should decisively appear that the Episcopalians of America would not consent to any essential departure from the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England. When satisfaction had been given, and power had been obtained, Doctor White and Doctor Provoost, and afterwards Doctor Madison, received Consecration at the hands of Archbishop Moore, in Lambeth Chapel. He strove also to obtain an enlargement of the ecclesiastical establishment in India, that it might be sufficient for the Christian population, while, in deference to the Com-

pany and the supposed safety of the British dominion, he waived all attempts for the conversion of the natives, except with their own desire. He was a zealous member of the Society for the Suppression of Vice; he pleaded earnestly for the mitigation of slavery and the religious instruction of the slaves; and, though participating very little in political discussions, he assented to some changes in favor of the Roman Catholics, while he spoke against a bill for the relief of the Quakers. It seems to have been much his habit to consult the body of Bishops on occasions of moment; and thus in 1798, he called them together in anticipation of an invasion, and communicated, in a very energetic letter, their decision to the Clergy of his Diocese; that the Clergy ought not then to enroll themselves in any military bodies, but that, if an invasion should be actually attempted, it would be their duty to assist in any manner in repelling the enemy. Happily, that alarm passed by. The Archbishop lived till the overflowings of ungodliness, and the apprehensions of good men, caused by the Revolution in France and the republican victories, had somewhat subsided, and Napoleon was sought in the Scriptural prophecies, by more than one interpreter. He died at Lambeth on the 18th of June, 1805, after much and severe illness.

King George the Third had a personal regard for Bishop Sutton, whom he had intimately known while he was Dean at Windsor. His fine person, his polished manners, his birth and connections, his excellent judgment, and his popular deportment, if not the highest order of qualifications for the metropolitan supervision, yet satisfied well the claims of the metropolitan dignity. Accordingly, the author of the *Pursuits of Literature*, who had written,

“Devout as Randolph, and as Sutton pure:”

and in another place,

“Sooner the people’s right shall Horsley prove,
Or Sutton cease to claim the public love,
And e’en forego, for dignity of place,
His polished mind, and reconciling face,”

foretold, in a note, his future elevation to the Primacy. When Bishop Vernon, two years after, was translated to York, it was remarked that the two tallest men, and, it might probably have been added, the two politest on the bench, were the two Archbishops. Liberal, and even profuse in his expenditures, and with a numerous family, Archbishop Sutton came

to Lambeth under some pecuniary embarrassment; but in progress of twenty-three years, during which the revenues of the See rose from twelve to twenty thousand pounds, he not only discharged all his obligations, but was enabled to bequeath to his children an estate of nearly two hundred thousand. Soon after his translation, he purchased Addington Park, in the county of Surrey, as a country residence for the Archbishops, in the place of Croydon Park; the accumulated proceeds of the sale of Croydon being now applied to the purchase. There, he built an elegant mansion, and much beautified the Church of the Parish. While his arrangements were splendid, his own personal habits were temperate and abstemious. Around him, he gathered, among his Chaplains, some of the most honored divines of England; Mant and D'Oyly, who prepared together under his eye the Family Bible of the Christian Knowledge Society, Wordsworth, Lonsdale, and Lloyd.

It was a subject of grateful mention with Archbishop Sutton, in his latter years, that during his Primacy, the Church, notwithstanding all its struggles, had advanced so far in external and spiritual prosperity, and in the hearts of the nation. New institutions of Christian benevolence had arisen on every side; the old had been filled with new vigor; and in the midst of strong assaults upon the Ecclesiastical Constitution, it was beginning to extend, more than five centuries, its arms around the whole people. It is true that his own hand had contributed no very decided impulse. But he had been firm in principle, and liberal in feeling, and had rather cheered than checked the various elements, over whose combined yet often discordant zeal, he was called to preside. In the chair of the ancient Church Societies, he seized the subject promptly, waived easily all irrelevant questions, and presented it with striking perspicuity; while he exercised authority without harshness, and control without offense. In Parliament, his pleasing voice was sometimes heard on topics of Ecclesiastical importance. He opposed the bills for the relief of the Roman Catholics; and his last speech was at the period when, for the last time, they were successfully resisted. The moderate line which he chose to pursue, subjected him, however, to the charge of temporizing; yet unjustly; for he seems to have yielded only where, as in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, charity and policy, and the general voice, were all united. Towards the beginning of his Primacy, he laid a foundation for the great efforts to educate the children of the land, through the Church, by directing all the Clergy to trans-

mit to their Bishops a report of the Schools in their Parishes, and of the number of uneducated children ; and near the end of his life he aided the establishment of King's College at London. The library at Lambeth was enriched by his gifts, and he caused a catalogue of its contents to be published. Cautious from habit and from principle, he cherished, at one time, it is said, some prejudices, which his longer experience threw away. He lived to complete his seventy-third year ; but in his latter days had much bodily suffering, and appeared thin and worn ; but when he was entreated to spare himself and seek ease, he said, " I desire to live no longer than I can be useful." For some time he was fully aware of his approaching dissolution, and awaited it with calm submission and humble confidence. It was on the twenty-first of July, 1828 ; and the House of Commons adjourned its proceedings, to allow his eldest son, who was its Speaker, to be present in the abode of death and mourning. When that son afterwards was raised to the Peerage, with universal approbation of his long and dignified impartiality and courtesy in the chair, he chose the title of Viscount Canterbury. One of the daughters of the Primate was married to the Rev. Mr. Croft, who was made Archdeacon of Canterbury ; and another was the wife of Bishop Percy of Carlisle. The Archbishop was buried in a family vault, under the Church at Addington ; and his widow, who was of his own age, was laid beside him at the end of three years.

Times of great agitation were at hand. A Parliament open to the adversaries of the Church ; a reform in the representation ; the elevation of another school of statesmen ; a general examination of abuses ; attempts to throw open the Universities, to remodel the Ecclesiastical arrangements throughout the land, to suppress or limit the Cathedral Offices, to change and extinguish Sees, to divert revenues, to generalize education ; a mighty reaction ; vast exertions for the supply of churches and ministers to destitute regions ; the revival of all claims ; the new discussion of all doctrines ; the repetition of all controversies ; the schemes and opinions of all classes of thinking men, cast ominous and exciting shadows before. A mild, a forbearing, a conscientious Primate, was needed for such times ; a Primate just firm enough to receive the reliance of all, but gentle enough to provoke no unnecessary shock. Such an one was found in Howley, the tried Bishop of London. England has probably never seen a Prelate more unblamed. He persevered in the policy of his predecessor, and was averse from changes, except such as were absolutely re-

quired by necessity or conscience. But when many were certain, he strove to meet and guide the measures of the Legislature. Once, in the storms that attended the Reform Bill, he was grossly insulted on his entrance into the city of Canterbury; a scene from which not even his meekness could protect him; a scene resembling none since the day when Laud was the victim. When the Ecclesiastical Commission was framed, Archbishop Howley was placed at its head, and wisely concurred in arrangements which, on the whole, perhaps in themselves, but certainly by satisfying popular objections, were expedient and useful. He was led to oppose the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Oxford, and afterwards to allude in Parliament to his opposition, which drew from the Professor a public and indignant remonstrance. The many designs which demanded charitable aid, and especially those of the colonial bishoprics, were uniformly sustained by the Primate with impartial benevolence. In the controversies which had their origin in the tracts for the times, he was at length called forth; but his interposition was so moderate, and his decision so cautiously avoided every extreme, that it could do little more than declare his own gentleness of spirit.

A large and stately addition to Lambeth Palace was in 1833 brought to completion. It is in the garden east of the old edifice, and presents long fronts of stone, the ornamental portions copied from the Abbeys of Westminster and St. Albans. Within, among other rooms, over which Maitland presided, is the library. His work was accomplished at an expense of eighty thousand pounds; but it is one of the least among the memorials of the Primacy of Howley. His life sank gently and gradually to its close, on the ninth of February, 1848; and he was borne, without pomp, to his modest burial-place at the Church of Addington.

The qualities which recommended the elder Bishop Sumner to the highest Ecclesiastical position and influence, were a calm dignity, moderation, and an Episcopate successful almost beyond parallel. It is said that at the confirmation of his election, one of the congregation exclaimed, "God bless the Archbishop of Canterbury;" and that the Primate elect turned and said, "I thank you; I indeed need all your prayers." He has the prayers of a vast communion, now extended almost around the globe; and those prayers are not the less earnest, because they proceed from hearts that look with veneration and with confidence, to the man as well as to the seat.

BISHOP CHASE'S REMINISCENCES.

ART. IV.—*An Autobiography.* Second Edition, in two volumes. 8vo. Boston: 1847.

SELDOM are we favored, during the life-time of the author, with a biographical sketch so voluminous, as the reminiscences of Bishop Chase. It is properly an auto-biography, though bearing the more comprehensive title of "*Reminiscences*;" for the events recorded are those in which the author was personally concerned. He figures not as a spectator, but as an actor in all. We do not say this in the way of censure, for it enhances the interest of the work. An author describes, with the most energy and vivacity, scenes and events, in which he has been personally interested. He can state not only the facts, but also the motives, of at least one of the actors, without error, only in so far as he is himself deceived. As we follow the narration, we are made acquainted with the hopes which stimulated to action, and the fears which dissuaded from it; with the joy of success, and the sorrow of disappointment, and with the faith which gave energy to effort, and support under discouragements.

But the biography of Bishop Chase is something more than the mere narrative of the fortunes of an individual. It has a deep historical interest. He entered upon life at a period when the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was beginning to put forth her energies, and his labors have been identified with the rapid increase and extension of that Church, especially in the new settlements. The records which he has made of his labors, as a pioneer missionary, are most valuable. We may learn from them what measures have been most successful, with the blessing of God, in planting the Church in the wilderness; and securing an influence in behalf of sound doctrine and pure religion, which will continue to be felt, when the wilderness has been turned into a fruitful field, filled with a busy population.

The work begins with an account of the author's ancestors, who were persons of the highest respectability, and, we must infer from what he relates of them, possessed no small share of the decision and energy of character, for which he himself has been so much distinguished. His early life was spent in agricultural labors, for which he had so decided a preference, that he was unwilling to relinquish them for the pursuits of learning; hoping that it might be his good fortune (being the

youngest son) to spend his days at the old homestead, and comfort the declining years of his beloved parents. Providence, however, had otherwise determined. After suffering much from two painful accidents, which successively interrupted his labors on the farm, at the earnest request of his father, he commenced his classical studies, and entered Dartmouth College when about seventeen years of age.

Educated a Congregationalist, it was not until after being in College two years, that he became acquainted with the Prayer Book, the examination of which produced a change in his opinions. His parents and several other relatives conformed to the Church about the same time, captivated by the beauty and scriptural character of her Liturgy, and convinced of her claims to an Apostolical Constitution and ministry. As respects himself he says:—p. 17, vol. 1.

“Having become ardently desirous of entering, when qualified, into the ministry, the question, who had the divine power and authority to ordain him, and thereby give him an Apostolical commission to preach and administer the sacraments, became a matter of the utmost consequence affecting his conscience. How this was answered, his course of life has shown. As he depended not on others' opinions, but examined for himself, even so let others do, always remembering that *truth* depends not on man, but God.”

No sooner had he united himself with the Church and received the Holy Communion, than we find him beginning his missionary career; officiating as a Lay Reader in Hartland and Bethel, Vermont, and in Cornish, New Hampshire. We pass over many interesting events in his life—his graduation at College at the age of twenty-one—his marriage the year after—his journey to Albany and introduction to the Rev. Mr. Ellison, Rector of St. Peter's Church in that city—his theological studies under the direction of that gentleman, while teaching school to defray his expenses—his ordination by Bishop Provost, in 1798, in the twenty-third year of his age.

Immediately after being admitted to Deacon's Orders, he was appointed itinerant missionary for the northern and western counties of New York, by the Missionary Society of the Diocese of New York, supposed to be the first society of the kind organized in the Church in the United States. He was the second Missionary employed by the Society; the Rev. Mr. Wetmore, its first missionary, having been compelled by ill health to discontinue his labors. He entered upon his duties with great energy and zeal—first visiting the northern counties, preaching in many places, and organizing two par-

ishes, one on the west side of Lake George, and one at Hampton, on the border of Vermont. From thence he directed his steps westward, and we find him shortly afterward organizing the Parish of Trinity Church, Utica. That flourishing city was then a hamlet, and though there were few to organize, it was done in humble faith; and now that little flock has become one of the largest congregations in Western New York.

At Auburn, or rather the place where Auburn now stands, the missionary remained some time, organized a Parish, and baptized a number of children, among whom were those of Mr. Bostwick, recently from Massachusetts. The country was entirely new; a few families only had settled in the neighborhood, and it was in the log cabin of Mr. Bostwick, containing only one room, that the Parish was organized. It may seem doubtful policy to some, thus to organize Parishes in the wilderness, and leave them without a Clergyman, but the result has shown the wisdom of such a course in the cases before us; for nearly all those early organizations have since become flourishing Parishes. Twenty-four years after, Bishop Chase passed through Auburn, and called on his old friend, Mr. Bostwick. We give the conversation that ensued in the language of the *Reminiscences*:

"You hardly know this place," said he, "the little one has become a thousand." "Where is the cabin in which I baptized your dear family?" "I will show you," said he, taking his hat and a great key, "we must stop at the Church as we go along." And so we did. There it stood, where the tall trees so lately occupied the ground, and shut out the light of heaven. It was a beautiful edifice, well furnished with pews and galleries, an organ, pulpit and altar. "This is the tree you planted; may it bear much fruit acceptable to the Heavenly Husbandman." "But where," asked the writer, "is the place on which your cabin stood?" "I will show you," was the reply. We walked some distance beyond the Church, and found ourselves in the bustle of business—warehouses on each side, lofty and well supplied—streets paved, and side-walks flagged. "Here," said he, "is the exact spot. But stop, let those coaches pass," at the same time pulling the writer by the arm. "Here," placing his staff upon the ground, "here is the spot where my cabin stood, and in which you baptized my children, preached to us, and incorporated our Parish." What reason we had for mutual congratulation, and for praise to Him who alone gives the power and grace to do his will, the reader may imagine." (Vol. i, p. 31.)

The visit of the missionary to Canandaigua, and the organization of a Parish there, and a further journey to Avon, on the Genesee River, completed his western tour, and he returned by the way he went, visiting the Parishes he had planted on his way out. The success of these efforts to establish the Church in Western New York, should teach us a lesson in the way of missionary enterprise in the new States.

Let our missionaries go at once into the new settlements, before the ground is pre-occupied by error and infidelity, and let them organize Parishes without waiting to know whether Clergymen can be found to take charge of them or not. A great deal is accomplished when a Parish is organized in a new settlement. The members feel a responsibility resting upon them to maintain public worship in some form, and some one can generally be found to officiate as a Lay Reader, till, from the naturally rapid increase of the population, there is sufficient ability to support a Clergyman.

On his return, Mr. Chase passed through Otsego County for the purpose of making a visit to the Rev. Mr. Nash, a Clergyman, who had devoted his life to the labor of planting the Church in the new settlements. His interview with this excellent man gave great satisfaction to both. The following passage will give some idea of the privations which the latter cheerfully endured, that he might preach the Gospel of CHRIST to the scattered population of that region :

"That man, who was afterwards most emphatically called 'FATHER NASH,' being the founder of the Church in Otsego County—who baptized great numbers, both of adults and children, and thus was the spiritual father of so many of the family of CHRIST, and who spent all his life and strength in toiling for their spiritual benefit—was, at this period, so little regarded by the Church at large, and even by his neighbors, that he had not the means to move his substance from one cabin to another, but with his own hands, assisted only by his wife and small children, and by a passing missionary. Well does the writer remember how the little one-roomed cabin looked as he entered it; its rude door hung on wooden hinges, creaking as they turned; how joyful that good man was, that he had been mindful to fetch a few nails, which he had used in the cabin, just left, for his comfort in this now the receptacle of all his substance. These he drove into the logs with great judgment, choosing the place most appropriate for his hat, his coat, and other garments of himself and family. All this while his patient wife, who, directing the children to kindle the fire, prepared the food for whom? Shall it be said a stranger? No: but for one who, by sympathy, felt himself more their brother than by all the ties of nature, and who, by the example now set before him, learned a lesson of inexpressible use to him all the days of his subsequent life." (Vol. i, p. 33.)

Father Nash, notwithstanding his privations, lived to a great age, and enjoyed excellent health; no doubt, owing, in part, to his great cheerfulness. The writer of this article had the pleasure of seeing him when far advanced in age. He was still poor in this world's goods; but rich in contentment and a confiding trust in God's Providence. He spoke of his life, as having been crowned with mercies, rather than oppressed with privation and suffering. His conversation was pious and reverent, and, at the same time, cheerful and entertaining, and

full of anecdote and humor. Even at that time of life, he looked upon the bright side of every thing, and appeared to have more of the simplicity and vivacity of youth, than most men in middle life.

Such an old age is not unfrequently the reward of a life cheerfully and earnestly employed in doing good to men. Father Nash has gone to his reward. He died in a good old age, happy in having been made the instrument of founding many flourishing Parishes, and esteemed and beloved by all who knew him.

After parting with Father Nash, our missionary spent some time in the southern part of Otsego County, in the discharge of his duty, and from thence went to Hudson, preached several times in that town and in others, situated on the North River, and in the autumn reached Poughkeepsie. There he was invited to take charge of the Parish of Christ Church, in connection with another Parish at Fishkill. The funds of the Society, which employed him, being exhausted, he was under the necessity of relinquishing the missionary work, for which he was so well fitted; and he therefore accepted the invitation. Shortly after, he was ordained Priest, in the city of New York, by Bishop Provost. At Poughkeepsie he remained nearly six years. Finding his salary insufficient for the support of his family, he at first opened a private school, and afterward accepted the charge of the public Academy. His pupils were numerous, and the labors of the school, together with the care of the two Parishes, over which he was placed, became too burdensome to be borne. This, together with the bad health of his wife, who was attacked with symptoms of pulmonary disease, induced him to accept an invitation to go to New Orleans, to see what could be done towards the organization of the Church in that city. Here we find him again employed in his proper vocation, planting the Church in regions where it was unknown before. A Parish was organized, under the name of Christ Church, with the provision that, for the present, the Clergyman settled there should be under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of New York. Having organized the Parish, a full account of which is given in the *Reminiscences*, he returned to the north for his family, whom he had left behind at Poughkeepsie. The account of his journeys we pass over, as also many interesting events, which occurred during his residence in New Orleans. He seems to have been entirely successful in his undertakings. His Parish continued to flourish, and a school, which he opened, was a source of great pecuniary emolument. He resided in New Orleans

nearly six years. At the end of that time, the health of his wife having improved, and a sufficient sum having been realized to put him in easy circumstances, he felt it his duty to return to the north for the purpose of educating his children. After visiting his connections in Vermont and New Hampshire, he decided to fix his residence at Cheshire, Connecticut, that his sons might enjoy the advantages of Cheshire Academy, then under the charge of the Rev. Tillotson Bronson, D. D. There he did not long remain, being called to the Rectorship of Christ Church, Hartford, where he remained till the spring of 1817.

Of his residence in Hartford he has recorded no reminiscences. A single paragraph headed, "*DAYS OF SUNSHINE*," is all that he devotes to it. Nor does he assign any reason for leaving this scene of his greatest happiness, except what is contained in the closing sentence, where, speaking of the happiness of his residence in Hartford, he says: "Of its sweets I tasted for a while, and thought myself happy; but God, who would train his servants more by the reality of suffering than by any ideal and transitory bliss, saw fit to direct my thoughts to other and more perilous duties." The author is entirely silent as to the motives which determined him to seek for a new field of labor in the west; but we may be well assured that it was not a selfish one. He left an opulent Parish literally for the wilderness. He was under the patronage of no Missionary Society, or associated body of men, but went forth depending upon his own limited means, and strong only in the faith of an overruling Providence.

Leaving his family in Hartford, he set out for Ohio on the 2d of March, 1817. The journey at that season of the year, was both wearisome and perilous. From Buffalo westward, the roads were bad, and there was no public conveyance, and he was obliged to hire a private conveyance to carry him forward along the shore of Lake Erie, on the ice, which in some places was covered with water, and in momentary danger of breaking up. He arrived at the scene of his future labors, and preached his first sermon in Ohio, on the 16th of March. Our limits forbid us to follow him through the new settlements of Ohio, preaching wherever he could collect a few persons to hear him, and organizing parishes wherever there was any prospect of permanency. He was every where received with joy, by the few scattered Churchmen resident in those new regions. As an example of this, we may copy the account of the manner in which he was received at Windsor.

"Judge Solomon Griswold, cousin to the presiding Bishop (Bishop Griswold) received the writer weary and way-sore. This worthy man was from West Windsor, in Connecticut, and with a few families, chiefly from Simsbury, had come into the north part of Ohio when an entire wilderness. Both himself and family had suffered exceedingly, but now began to live with some comfort in temporal things. Yet as to the important concerns of the eternal world, there was only enough left on their minds to make them feel their wants. 'I am overjoyed,' said he, 'to see a Church Clergyman, one who is duly authorized to administer the Sacraments. I have read prayers here in the woods for several years. The scattered flock of CHRIST have been thus kept mindful that there is a fold; you, I trust, have come to gather them in, and to feed them with heavenly food. I bless God that I see you among us. I began to think our Church would never visit the frontiers.'" (Vol. i, p. 129.)

Traveling through the entire length of the State, he reached Cincinnati, where he organized the Parish of Christ Church. General Harrison, the late lamented President of the United States, was among those who took an active part in this work, and also in promoting the interests of religion throughout the State. In these first missionary efforts in Ohio, we recognize the same principle of action as in those in which he was engaged in Western New York, and they were crowned with a like success. By looking over the Journals of the Ohio Conventions, the reader will find flourishing congregations in nearly all the towns where the Church was planted at this early period.

Having purchased a farm near Worthington for the future home of his family, he wrote to Mrs. Chase to join him at Cleveland. An account of their journey from Cleveland to Worthington, is given in a letter to his son, who remained at the east. It exhibits some of the inconveniences of traveling in a new country. We transcribe a portion of it, descriptive of a common occurrence in such regions, the passage over a swollen stream, the danger of which is more apparent than real, when the passage is conducted by skillful hands.

"The sun was about an half hour high when we reached the river, the stream not very wide, but deep and rapid. Two or three men were with Mr. S——'s wagon, and there were two or three sons of the forest who had come to our assistance, well acquainted with the water, and good swimmers. They were from fourteen to sixteen years of age, and the most obliging fellows I ever saw. The only means of transportation we had was a canoe from twelve to fifteen feet long, and broad enough in the broadest place, for a man of my size to sit down by squeezing a little.

"The young woodsmen mounted the horses with more adroitness than a riding master, without a bridle, and dashed them down a steep bank into the stream, to them bottomless. The first you would see after such a process, would be the heads of the boy and the horse, and then, from the rebound and struggle of the animal, would be the fore legs striking in quick succession

the swift surface of the stream; then, by cuffing one side or the other, as they steered either this way or the opposite, up or down the stream, they got them all safe across, and feeding in the luxuriant pastures on the other side. Now for our wagons and baggage, and for our precious selves. The bodies of the wagons were put, I should say poised, on our little canoe; a pound's weight seemingly would have been, on either side, fatal to them; yet the lads managed them. Did you ever see rope dancers? I have, and I assure you it was nothing to it. They stood in the presence of the gazing spectators, on the bow and stern of this little bark, and got them safe across the flowing tide. The wheels were transported in the same way, and such was the smallness of the skiff and the rapidity of the current, that the wheels, as the bow of the canoe was kept nearly up the stream, were kept in motion, as if they were on land passing along. Then with your little brother in my arms, I committed myself to the mere pig's trough. Did I look back at your mother as we pushed the precious load from the firm land? I did; a mother's prayer was read in her every feature, and a mother's prayer was graciously answered. We got safe to shore.

"What think you of my feelings, as our brave lads took on board their next precious cargo, your dear mother and aunt Almira? I watched the motion of the little ark of safety, till all was well? Blessed be God, all was well. Unconscious of its rapid speed, we saw not the sun set, till the shades of the evening showed us how much in haste we ought to be." (Vol. i, p. 137.)

Less than a year had passed away, before we find our author, with characteristic energy, presiding at the primary Convention of the Diocese of Ohio. This Convention assembled in January, 1818, and again in June of the same year, when he was unanimously chosen Bishop of Ohio. Previous to this he had suffered a severe domestic affliction. His wife, naturally of a feeble constitution, being subject to pulmonary complaints, appears to have been unable to bear the change of climate and the hardships of a new country. Her health began rapidly to decline in the winter of 1818, and she departed to her rest on the 5th of May, of the same year.

Soon after his election to the Episcopate of Ohio, he set off for Philadelphia, in order to be Consecrated to that sacred office. When he arrived at Baltimore, he learned that some of the Standing Committees withheld their consent to his Consecration, on the ground of rumors unfavorable to his character. He requested an investigation, and after some delay, and a careful examination of the facts, their consent was obtained, and he was Consecrated in Philadelphia, by Bishop White, Bishops Hobart of New York, and Kemp of Maryland, being present and assisting.

With mingled emotions of fear, and hope, and thankfulness, the newly Consecrated Bishop set out for Ohio; and after performing some Episcopal duty by the way, after he entered his Diocese, he arrived at his home near Worthington, in March, 1819. After making such domestic arrangements as

would allow of his protracted absence from home, he began his Diocesan duties with earnestness and zeal, and if we may judge from what he has recorded of those early Episcopal duties, with unmingled satisfaction. The following is an account of a visit to a solitary family in Ohio.

"These people were formerly from Ireland, and in their own country were what are called *English Protestants*, bred to a liberal and pious way of thinking, and to a more than ordinary courteousness of deportment. Emigrating from their own, and coming to this country, in the early settlement of Ohio, they fixed themselves here in the woods, and underwent the many deprivations and hardships incident to a new establishment.

"Ardently attached to the Church, they could not but think of her and her pleasant things, though they had but little prospect of seeing her prosperity. The Rev. Dr. Doddridge, the nearest, and for many years, the only Episcopal Clergyman in the country, lived some twenty miles from them on the Virginia side of the Ohio. Such were his avocations that he had never been among them. Here they were, isolated and alone, as sheep having no shepherd. Finley the elder, 'the old man of whom I spake, was yet alive;' yet only so alive as that they were obliged to raise him up to salute me, as I approached his bed. As I took his hand, trembling with age and weakness, he burst into tears and sobbed aloud. The grateful effusions of his heart, at the sight of a Minister of the blessed JESUS, were made intelligible by the most affecting ejaculations to God, his Maker, Saviour, and Sanctifier. 'I see my Spiritual Father,' said he, 'my Bishop, the Shepherd of the Flock of CHRIST, of which I have always considered myself, and my little lambs about me, the members, but too unworthy, I feared, to be sought and found in this manner. O sir! do I live to see this happy day? yes, 'tis even so. Blessed LORD! Holy JESUS! Thou who once camest in great humility, to seek and to save that which was lost, receive the tribute of my grateful heart. Now let thy servant depart in peace.' As the venerable man spake forth the effusions of his mind in words like these, he bowed his gray hairs, and begged the prayers and benedictions of the Church. They were afforded; and cold must that heart be, which, under such circumstances, would refuse to be fervent. The Visitation Office was performed, in which the family, joined by the neighbors hastily assembled, participated." (Vol. i, p. 153.)

But whatever pleasure he may have found in the discharge of his duties, the want of an adequate support was a cause of great inconvenience. In the winter of 1820-21, he complains that he was obliged to discharge his hired man, and to perform himself, all the winter labor of the farm; "to thresh the grain, to haul and cut the wood, to build the fires, and feed the stock." At the time he seems to have felt it a degradation; yet now he tells us, that he looks back upon those hours of painful anxiety as most productive of future good. We can not agree with him in his views of the degradation which manual labor brings upon the sacred office. If St. Paul labored with his hands, that he might not be "chargeable to any," while, at the same time, he asserts his right to claim a support from the Church; it could not be degrading to a mod-

ern Bishop to do the same, when the Church withholds from him the due reward of his labors. The Church is indeed blameworthy, but not the Bishop. We do not excuse the fault of the Church in neglecting to send well paid missionaries into the new States ; yet we wish that there were more self-denying men, willing to follow any honest calling, laboring with their hands, if need be, for CHRIST's sake, for the salvation of men, and the building up of the Kingdom of CHRIST in the world.

But whatever may have been the pecuniary trials of Bishop Chase, they did not lessen his zeal in his appointed work. There were, at this time, but six Clergymen in his Diocese, and very many of the Parishes were without ministers to instruct the people, and prepare the candidates for Confirmation. Yet in the year 1820-21, he confirmed one hundred and seventy-four persons, baptized fifty, preached one hundred and eighty-two times, and traveled twelve hundred and seventy-nine miles on horseback.

In the autumn of the same year, in order to secure the means of support for his family, he accepted the Presidency of a College in Cincinnati, and removed thither shortly afterwards. But he did not remain long in that office. The Journals of the Ohio Convention, and the Bishop's Address, had been favorably noticed in England, and it excited the hope that aid might be obtained from thence, to found a Seminary in Ohio, for the education of young men for the ministry. No sooner had he conceived the idea, than with characteristic decision and energy, he made preparation to go to England and solicit, in person, the aid of British Christians. The first idea of the measure was suggested by his son, at the Convention in June, 1823. On the 29th of July, he addressed a letter to the Bishops of the American Church, announcing his intention, and by the first of October, he was in New York, ready to embark for England.

On his arrival at New York, he was met by an opposition to his project, altogether unexpected.

We have not, in the work before us, the means of forming any particular judgment of the controversy, and we shall not now supply what the author has omitted. Bishop Chase does not even give in full his own side of the question, and studiously avoids giving the names of those who were most active in their opposition. He seems to write as desiring to record the fact of the opposition, without identifying the parties. One ground of opposition, however, was the fear that the establishment of a Theological Seminary in the west might disturb the

unity of the Church, and, in the end, lead to dissension and schism.

It was the wish of Bishop Hobart, and many others, that all the Clergy of the American Church should be educated at the same Seminary, as a means of promoting unity of doctrine and sentiment. But hardly had this scheme been adopted by the Church, and a General Theological Seminary organized, than the proposal to establish another institution of the same kind in Ohio, seemed to break in upon it, and prepare the way for other enterprises of the same kind. Bishop Hobart, therefore, opposed it with all his energy; and if we are obliged to think that his opposition was carried beyond due bounds, we ought rather to ascribe it to the ardor of his temperament, than to any envious or selfish motive. We see now, indeed, that the scheme of a Seminary, for the whole American Church, would not be practicable, if desirable; but we must take into the account the rapid increase of the Church, and its extension over a wide expanse of territory, beyond what even Bishop Chase, sanguine as he was, could have dared to hope.

When Bishop Chase arrived in England, he found that the threat of opposition had already been executed. An article had appeared in the British Critic, putting the public on their guard against him, and he himself was very coldly received. He wisely resolved not to reply publicly, but to put forth an appeal in behalf of Ohio, simply stating the facts in the case, and leaving the public to judge.

Previous to putting forth the appeal, Providence had most unexpectedly raised up friends for him, who entered warmly into his cause, and who, both on account of their high station in society, and the confidence reposed in their judgment, were able to serve him effectually. The record of his stay in England is mostly made up of letters to his wife and the correspondence between himself and his English friends. It is by no means the least interesting part of the *Reminiscences*. His own letters breathe throughout the most fervent zeal, and confident faith. He recognizes the hand of God in every instance of success, and has frequent occasion to realize the truth of the motto of his whole life, "Jehovah Jireh," "the Lord will provide." No one can read the letters of his English friends without being struck with the simple, heartfelt piety which appears in every line; or without feeling how unjust is the reproach that some in this country would cast upon the Church of England, when they represent her as devoid of piety and zeal. We forbear giving extracts from any of these letters, as it is only by reading them in connection

with the account of the circumstances in which they were written, that they can be duly appreciated.

The amount, afterwards transmitted to Ohio as the fruits of this journey to England, was not far from thirty thousand dollars, although the time spent in England was but a little more than eight months; a portion of which was consumed in removing the prejudices which had been excited against the Ohio cause. Bishop Chase landed at Liverpool on the third day of November, 1823, and set sail from the same port, on the twentieth of July, in the year following. The passage across the Atlantic, and the journey over the mountains, consumed between two and three months. We find him at Worthington on the 14th of October, and as early as the 3d of November the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio assembled at Chillicothe, to act upon the proposal to found a Theological Seminary with the funds collected in England. At this Convention the preliminary steps only were taken, and the question of location was left for the consideration of the next annual Convention. The remarks of Bishop Chase, before this Convention, on the comparative advantage of locating institutions of learning in the country or in large towns, we commend to the consideration of all who are interested in collegiate education. We quote from that part, in which he speaks of the temptations to which students are exposed in cities :

"Such is the nature of civil government, that it must be employed rather in *punishing* than in *preventing* vice. Thus, of necessity, the woe falls more upon the *seduced* than upon the *seducer*. The *tempted* is punished, while the *tempter* often, too often, escapes unhurt. In schools and colleges placed in cities, and receiving students from abroad, these evils are most alarmingly apparent. Young men are often disgraced by punishment, and sometimes ruined by expulsion; while, when compared with their seducers, they are innocent, and those who enticed them from the paths of rectitude, chiefly ought to suffer.

There is a time in youth when the body, not the mind, has attained maturity—a time when, amid the storms of passion, reason's feeble voice is scarcely heard—a time, when inexperience blinds the eye, and pleasure, like an opiate, lulls the conscience fatally to sleep—a time, when the paths of sin, though they end in death, are, by the arts of Satan, strewn with flowers—a time, when all restraint, though imposed by mercy's self, seems hard and galling. There is in youth a time like this, and this is that which is commonly spent at college, when, for the want of means to prevent temptation, they are more exposed to the seducements of designing persons." (Vol. i, p. 444.)

In accordance with the suggestions of the Bishop, it was determined to place the new institution in the country; and in order to secure it from the proximity of troublesome neighbors, eight thousand acres of land were purchased, at a cost of eighteen thousand dollars. And now commenced one of

the most active periods of the Bishop's life. The interests of the Diocese were to be attended to, Episcopal duties performed, the College grounds cleared up, buildings erected, and a school to be kept up, in order to collect students for the College. In a new country it is extremely difficult to obtain workmen, and such as can be obtained are unskillful, and being unaccustomed to work together in any considerable numbers, require an active and vigilant overseer. The Bishop went himself to the ground, erected a rude shanty in which he slept, and was with the workmen, both at their meals and at their labors. From the first he determined that no ardent spirits should be used on the ground, which was an unheard of restriction at that time. The workmen murmured, and at length combined together to demand the usual indulgence; but he was firm, and by kind words, persuaded them to continue in his employ without it.

We might easily conceive how happy a man, of Bishop Chase's temperament, might be in the excitements of his new and varied employments. It was, in some sense, the beginning of the consummation of his hopes, the fruits of the trials of his expedition to England. Besides, there is a pleasure in beholding the alterations wrought by human industry in the rough aspects of a forest scene, and in anticipating still greater changes, when stately buildings, thronged with the youthful votaries of learning, should crown the swelling hill chosen for the site of the College. Yet soon new difficulties presented themselves, calling for stronger faith and still greater exertions. Exposure to the night air, in his rude habitation, brought on an intermittent fever. The funds he had obtained from England had been nearly absorbed in the purchase of the land, and in the improvements already made, and he must either stop short in his enterprise, or obtain the means of carrying it on by an appeal to the liberality of the people of the Atlantic States.

He had hardly recovered from his sickness, when we find him on his way to the east, for the double purpose of attending the General Convention and soliciting subscriptions for the Seminary. An appeal was put forth in behalf of his enterprise, and it was answered by a liberality beyond his expectations. The result was an addition of about \$25,000 to the funds already obtained; ten thousand of this sum being pledged to constitute a Professorship of Divinity. So sanguine was Bishop Chase of complete success, at this time, that a correspondence was actually entered into, with the view of obtaining the services of the Rev. T. H. Horne, of

London, as a Professor in the Ohio Seminary. An application to Congress for a grant of the township of land, was made about the same time. A Bill for that purpose actually passed the Senate, but was lost in the Lower House, mostly on account of the opposition of certain members from Ohio, who thought it would be favoring one College above others in the State. Notwithstanding this disappointment, the work went on, and in the summer of 1829, the buildings, though not completed, were occupied by about seventy students.

An extract from a letter of Bishop Chase to Lord Gambier, afterwards published in England in the *Missionary Register*, will show how sincerely he rejoiced in the results of his labors.

"But it is a yet more pleasing task to record the moral and religious state of the College. A great proportion of our students are pious men, and of the remainder, there are few whose conduct is in the least exceptionable. The result of this is a great desire to do good to others, and wide is the field and abundant the means to gratify their wishes. Except what the College has afforded, scarcely an efficient Sunday School was to be found for many miles. Many families had not a Bible in their houses, and when they had Bibles, the children could not read them. Of this ignorance, vice in all its forms was the natural offspring. Blessed be God, the face of things is now changed; Sunday Schools, and Bible Classes, and Bible Societies, are the means, and our scholars are the instruments of bringing these means into action, and God crowns the whole." (Vol. ii, p. 43.)

We can not forbear making another extract, which shows how highly the Bishop appreciated the aid rendered him by his excellent wife, in the complicated concerns which claimed his attention.

"This family amounts to nearly one hundred persons. My wife is the main-spring of this immense domestic machine, so that if it be asked in future ages, 'How could this College in the woods, and in the want of so many ordinary means and facilities, ever have succeeded?' let it be replied, 'There was an humble female, who, though surrounded by her own little children, stood at the helm, as mother in the Israel of God,—advising the doubtful—encouraging the timid—smiling on the obedient—frowning on the refractory—soothing the sorrowful—comforting the afflicted, and administering to the sick; and in an uncommon degree causing all to look to her for example, especially in deprivations and sufferings; and all this with such unostentatious deportment and unperceived effort, as to appear (except to those who carefully observed her) no more than any other.'" (Vol. ii, p. 44.)

Indeed, he reposed the utmost confidence in her judgment, and never had reason to repent of it. When absent in the discharge of his Episcopal duties, he devolved on her the responsibility of the business department of the Seminary, as the following instrument shows:

"10TH NOVEMBER, 1829.

"All bargains obligating the Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio, of which I am the sole agent, must be subject to the approval of Mrs. S. M. Chase, my wife, in my absence from Gambier.
PHILANDER CHASE."

At this period, he little thought of the trials that awaited him, or how soon his confident anticipations of complete success, were to be sadly disappointed. Insinuations of mismanagement of the funds were circulated in distant places, and gained some credit; although it was, or might have been known, that he was obliged to account regularly to the Trustees of the Seminary for every dollar that passed through his hands. Dissensions arose in his own Diocese. The Professors of the Seminary were arrayed in opposition against him. Environed with difficulties, and unable to carry on the Institution according to the expressed will of the contributors to its funds, he felt constrained in the year 1831, to resign the Presidency, together with the Episcopate of Ohio. We purposely omit going into a detail of these transactions, as the limits of our article would prevent us from doing justice to the parties concerned. We can only remark, that questionable as might have been the conduct of the Professors and of the Convention, we fear that the Bishop was too hasty in sending in his resignation; and so it seemed at the time to persons residing at a distance, and not involved in the dispute. To many, the news of his resignation brought the first knowledge of the difficulty. We are inclined to think, that forbearance, and firmness, and perseverance on the part of the Bishop, might in time have brought about a reconciliation, and secured the peace of the Diocese, and the prosperity of the Seminary.

That he acted conscientiously in resigning, we do not doubt; for it was done at a great sacrifice of private interest. At the age of fifty-six, and with a heavy heart, as we may well imagine, he left the scene of his labors, and took up his abode in the wilderness, in a log cabin on a farm belonging to his niece, a small portion only of which was cleared. Here, however, he remained but a short time, and we next find him among the pioneer settlers of the southern part of Michigan. He describes the country as extremely beautiful and fertile, and almost without inhabitants. With his usual spirit and energy he carried on the work of improvement, erecting comfortable buildings, subduing the soil, and fitting his new farm for cultivation. But amidst these labors, he was not unmindful of higher duties.

He soon arranged a regular course for his clerical labors, and performed them as systematically and earnestly on Sundays, as if he had not been compelled to work with his hands during the week. We have not room to describe those labors, and must refer the reader to the book itself, of which the account of his residence in Michigan forms an interesting portion. He was not long, however, to remain in seclusion. Three years after he removed to Michigan, he was chosen Bishop of Illinois by the primary Convention of that Diocese. This call to a new field of labor, as it was entirely unsought and unexpected by himself, he could look upon in no other light, than the Providence of God directing him to new duties and perhaps to new trials. He did not, therefore, feel at liberty to decline the appointment. So little was he given to delay, when satisfied that he was obeying the call of duty, that in his letter accepting the Episcopate of Illinois, he regrets that he should not be able to leave his home to enter upon his duties in less than *one month*, and even then should find it advisable to leave his family behind. He received the notice of his election in April, 1835, and early in the month following, started on a tour through the State of Illinois. He found little there to gratify either ambition, or the love of ease. His Diocese extended over an area of 55,000 square miles; but in this whole region then, there had been but one Episcopal Church erected, and the whole number of the Clergy was only six, four Priests, and two Deacons. But it was a field of immense importance for the future. Equal in extent to England and Wales together, and exceeding in fertility any portion of the globe of equal area, he could not but look forward to the time, when it would be filled with millions of immortal souls, whose everlasting weal or woe might depend upon the results of his labors.

In the autumn of 1835, the General Convention met in Philadelphia. At that Convention the Diocese of Illinois was received into union with the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and the appointment of Bishop Chase to the Episcopate confirmed. And now he was to begin his labors in reality, and what had he to depend upon?

To England, the eye of hope was as naturally and as necessarily raised for Illinois, as it had been in 1823 for Ohio. And though the prospect of success had a shade over it, yet the one motto triumphed—"Jehovah Jireh"—"God will provide." His treasury is never exhausted, and will pour forth its treasures to all who obey his will. (Vol. ii, p. 233.)

As before, he seems to have been received with great kindness in England, and considerable sums were given him to found a College in Illinois, and some for his own private use. Donations for both purposes, in considerable amounts, continued to reach him after his return.

Returning from England in May, 1836, he set out immediately for his home in Michigan, and in a few days was on his way, with his family, to take up his abode in Illinois; but as it would appear, without any definite idea of the place where he would ultimately settle. A location was at length chosen near the middle of the State, in Peoria County, on lands not yet brought into the market by the United States' Government. His only resource was to erect a temporary dwelling on these unoccupied lands, and wait till they should be offered for sale.

Having erected a log cabin in the vicinity of the place where he hoped to locate the College, he took up his abode in it with his family; but it was not till December, 1838, that the lands came into market, and he was able to secure the title. The purchase amounted to twenty-eight hundred acres, of great fertility, and having, besides other natural advantages, inexhaustible beds of bituminous coal, and a considerable stream of water, with sites suitable for the erection of mills. If well managed, it can not fail to become in time exceedingly valuable, and may of itself constitute an ample endowment for an institution of learning.

In the spring of 1839, the corner stone of JUBILEE COLLEGE was laid, with appropriate ceremonies, and shortly after, the Bishop made the tour of the Atlantic States, soliciting additional funds for the erection of the buildings, and the endowment of professorships. In this he succeeded beyond the expectations of all; for it was a time of great commercial embarrassments, most unpropitious for such an enterprise.

With the history of Jubilee College, and the labors of Bishop Chase, since 1839, our readers are probably all familiar, and we will only add, that a Charter was obtained for the College, from the Legislature of Illinois, in 1846. Any one who reads that Charter, can not fail to observe how carefully the funds contributed are secured, for the benefit of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and guarded against misapplication and abuse of trust. One thing only strikes us as singular in this Charter. It does not create a Body Corporate, by the Act of the Legislature, but makes it lawful for Bishop Chase to "nominate and appoint, in his last will and testament, or otherwise," the trustees, who, with the President, (who is always to be the Bishop of the Diocese,) are to form a Body Corporate. Until

such nomination shall be made, the Bishop retains the whole management of the College and its property in his own hands. The benefactors of Jubilee College entrusted Bishop Chase with the means to endow the institution, having knowledge of all the circumstances, and in entire reliance on his integrity and ability, and will not object to his retaining the control of it while he lives. If any one fears that he may mis-apply the funds, or neglect to execute that part of the Charter which it belongs to him to do, let him read carefully the *Reminiscences*, and then ask whether it is probable, that one who has spent a long life so laboriously, and disinterestedly, for the good of others and the Church, would be likely to crown that life with an act of dishonesty.

It must be a source of consolation to Bishop Chase now, in his old age, to see the growing results of his toils and privations. Perhaps no man, now living, has performed an equal amount of labor, or done so much for the promotion of learning and religion, in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. Amidst discouragements, which would have palsied the energies of an ordinary man, he has planted, we may say, an hundred Parishes in the wilderness, and founded two Colleges, which will continue to carry on the work which he has begun, we hope, for generations, after he has gone to his reward.

We do not anticipate an extensive sale for the *Reminiscences*. The former imperfect edition has satisfied, in some degree, the curiosity of the public, and supplied those who have sympathised with the author in his later labors, with all that they wished to know of his early life. Still, it will be well for those who feel an interest in the extension of the Church among the rapidly increasing population of the Western States, to have these *Reminiscences* in a permanent form. Had the work been less voluminous, and written more in the form of a continuous narrative, it might have been more entertaining to the cursory reader, and have secured a wider circulation. As it is, however, it has a higher interest for those who are accustomed to look for the motives of human action, and trace the effect of success or disappointment, upon the minds of those who make an impression on the age in which they live.

The correspondence, which makes up a good share of the work, breathes a spirit of faith, and sincerity, and piety, which will command the sympathy of every sober-minded and earnest Christian.

OLIVER CROMWELL.

ART. V.—*The Life of Oliver Cromwell.* By T. J. HEADLEY.
New York: Baker & Scribner, 1848.

The Protector, a Vindication. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE,
D. D. New York: Robert Carter, 1847.

*The History of the English Revolution of 1640, commonly
called the Great Rebellion.* By F. GUIZOT, (late) Prime
Minister of France, &c. &c. Translated by WILLIAM
HAZLITT. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1846.

*History of the Commonwealth of England, from its com-
mencement to the restoration of Charles II.* By WILLIAM
GODWIN. London: Colburn, 1828.

Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. By THOMAS CAR-
LYLE. 2 vols. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1847.

A DISTINGUISHED historian has remarked of Archbishop Laud, that more good and more evil has been spoken and written of him than of almost any other historical character that can be named. The same observation may with justice be applied to Oliver Cromwell, the most remarkable individual whose lot was cast in the stormy times in which Laud struggled, suffered and died. If we are to depend upon the general verdict of Christendom, long since pronounced upon his character and career, we can not hesitate to place him among the number of those ambitious men, who have attained dominion, by a bold and skillful use of the advantages of a remarkable position, and the arbitrary exercise of power, basely won, but wielded with consummate vigor and ability. When we read the opinions pronounced upon him by his contemporaries, we are at no loss to discover the data upon which this verdict is based. The charges of his opponents, sustained by facts spread upon the page of history, are scarcely more decisive than the reluctant admissions of his friends and abettors, and the indignant denunciations of many great and good men, who thought and acted with him during part of his career, but refused to proceed with him through the devious ways of intrigue and bloodshed by which he won his way to supreme power in England. Lord Clarendon called him "a brave wicked man;" Cardinal Mazarin, puzzled by the same inconsistency between his professions and his actions which still renders his character a historical problem, described him as a "fortunate madman;" while Father Orleans sums up the review of his life by pronouncing him a "judicious

villain." If such epithets are deemed justly liable to suspicion as proceeding from men whose position on leading questions of politics and religion was very different from that of Cromwell, we find them almost literally echoed by writers of another stamp, stanch republicans, Puritans and unyielding opponents of the King. Among these we may mention Denzil Hollis, whom Guizot, in view of his fearless exposure in the republican cause, and his sufferings from his arbitrary imprisonment by Charles, justly characterizes as "the sincere friend of liberty." Mr. Carlyle, indeed, endeavors to invalidate his testimony by sheer invective, unsupported by evidence, with singular flippancy pronouncing his narrative to be "mere blind rage, distraction and darkness," which gem of sapient criticism is eagerly snatched up and as eagerly exhibited, as pure truth, by Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, and our own voluminous and aspiring countryman, Mr. J. T. Headley. Of the same nature is the indignant reproof of that Puritan hero and almost martyr, honest John Lilburne, or "Free-born John," as he styled himself, characterized by Dr. Merle D'Aubigné as the "least credulous of the republicans, who from the bottom of his dungeon caused all England to ring with tidings of the "deceit, treachery and hypocrisy" of Oliver and his party. Mrs. Hutchinson, speaking of his conduct when in power, says, "He weeded, in a few months time, above a hundred and fifty goodly officers out of the army, with whom many of the religious soldiers went off; and in their room, abundance of the king's dissolute soldiers were entertained, and the army was almost changed from that godly religious army, whose valour God had crowned with triumph, into the dissolute army they had beaten, bearing yet a better name. His court was full of sin and vanity, and the more abominable because they had not yet quite cast away the name of God, but profaned by taking it in vain upon them. True religion was now almost lost, even among the religious party, and hypocrisy became an epidemical disease." This account, sad as it is, is confirmed by the sorrowful remonstrances of those two pure-minded and honest men, John Howe and Owen, who were both for a brief period Chaplains to the Protector, but who speedily abandoned his court, in disgust at the confusion and iniquity that reigned there. Their testimony is given at length in the notes to Orme's *Life of Baxter*. With every allowance, therefore, which the largest charity can be disposed to make, without compromising its noblest attribute of "rejoicing in the truth," a cloud must ever rest upon the memory of Oliver Cromwell. We are not among

those who suppose him to have been, through his whole career, an essentially dishonest and unprincipled man. It will take more evidence than we have yet seen, to induce us to the belief that he was from the beginning without self-delusion or remorse, the "judicious villain" which Father Orleans calls him. He has shared the fate of all great men, whom history is so apt to make consistent prodigies, either as monsters of evil, or as spotless examples of purity and virtue;—elevating or condemning them in the gross, in that peculiar mode of anathema or apotheosis, whereby every circumstance of life and action is blended in the intense light of blind admiration, or lost in the overpowering darkness of violent prejudice. "Fortune," says Sallust, "bears sovereign influence over every thing: it is she that brightens or obscures all things, more from caprice and humor than from a regard to truth and justice." It was Cromwell's "fortune" to be eminently successful in a cause which, whether good or bad, allowed him to turn circumstances to his own advantage, and ultimately to lose sight of the cause which he had doubtless sincerely embraced, in the accomplishment of the purposes of his own interest and ambition, and thus to win a position which he allowed himself to maintain at all hazards, and even at the expense of law, religion and humanity.

It is somewhat singular, to say the least, that at this day, with all the aids to a clear understanding of the times and the men of that period of confusion and strife which ended in the establishment of English liberty, and the formation of the English constitution, an attempt should be made to canonize Cromwell as a saint and hero of spotless purity and integrity. To this desperate undertaking Thomas Carlyle has addressed himself with all the energy of his ardent and erratic intellect, while the grave Genevan professor, whose "Vindication" so suddenly transformed him from a professedly impartial historian of Protestantism to a party-writer, carries out Mr. Carlyle's conclusions to the "extremest verge" and by what seems to us, at least, a very irreverent application of Scripture, in so doubtful a case as Cromwell's, boldly claims for him the love of every Christian man. "I claim boldly," he says, "on his behalf the benefit of that passage of Scripture, '*Every one that loveth God that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of Him.*'" And in doing this he deems himself to be only fulfilling a Christian duty; for he adds—"Above all I remember that if a Christian ought to confess the Lord upon earth, in order that he may be one day confessed before the angels in heaven, it is also his duty to confess the disciples

of the LORD, particularly when they are disowned, calumniated and despised by the multitude. '*Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*'"

We shall have occasion in the course of our remarks to inquire how far Dr. D'Aubigné has succeeded in his task of vindication. Our attention must first be occupied by a writer of very different character and *calibré*, who, in conjunction with Dr. Cheever, (in the last number of the Biblical Repository,) has undertaken the work of setting aside, on this side of the Atlantic, the verdict of history, and of elevating Cromwell in the estimation of the honest republicans of these United States, to the double attitude of a peerless hero of liberty, and a saintly champion of Protestantism; claiming for him as a man and a Christian, every perfection to which poor human nature, in the noblest specimens of earnest and sanctified manhood, has ever approached.

We have placed Mr. Headley's book first upon our list, not because its merits entitle it to such a position, but simply because it is the production of an American writer, and as such likely to be read by that large class of our fellow-citizens, who, having neither the leisure nor the inclination to study the subject thoroughly for themselves, will be disposed to yield their minds to his guidance. But we hesitate not to say, that judging from the specimens already given to the public, we know of no teacher more unsafe and superficial than Mr. Headley. We have given his book a patient, and we trust, a candid perusal, and are entirely at loss to discover in what his qualifications for his task especially consist. To ascribe to him an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the historical period through most of which the life of Cromwell extends, or of the times which preceded it, from the great religious agitation produced by the English Reformation, would be an uncivil mockery, infinitely more galling to an honorable mind than the severest criticism. To say that his work gives evidence of industry in historical research, that "reading up," for the occasion which might have allowed it to pass muster respectably, would be a compliment scarcely less equivocal, inasmuch as all that is really worth reading in his memoir, is but a feeble reflection of the two volumes of Mr. Thomas Carlyle. This latter circumstance has obtruded itself so frequently and forcibly upon our notice during its perusal, that we can not help fancying the peculiar emotions which the distinguished editor of the "Letters and Speeches," must be the subject should he ever be tempted to look in its pages.

What a distorted image of himself will meet his astonished glance, faithfully reflecting, indeed, all that is grotesque and absurd, but strangely marring all that is picturesque, manly and beautiful. If the narrative of Denzil Hollis figured itself to Mr. Carlyle's excited imagination, as "mere blind rage, distraction and darkness," what is it possible for him to think of the wholesale invective, the indiscriminate blunders, the confusion worse confounded of the battle scenes, the *furor strepitumque*, the dust and din, neither Olympian, nor Homeric of Mr. Headley's chapters.

Mr. Headley's irrepressible desire of fine writing, of vivid and impressive description, continually urges him beyond the bounds of truth and propriety, while his determined prejudice in favor of Oliver, causes him to pass by with supreme indifference, and a contemptuous shrug altogether admirable, every circumstance which places his conduct and principles in a doubtful light. Every attempt to venture beyond the mere surface of his subject into the depths of argument and discussion, is sure to betray his lack of intellectual discipline and precision. If we may venture to repeat an illustration somewhat common, in the language of an English critic, he reminds us of a person who should venture to lay about him with a flail, without sufficient skill in the use of that somewhat unmanageable instrument; and he is guilty occasionally of such awkward aggressions on his own cranium, as makes his readers tremble both for him and his cause.

Before we proceed to show what Mr. Headley's success has been in writing against the current of history, there are one or two passages in his preface, which ought not to be passed over. With singular *naïveté*, he says :

"Some may object to the battle scenes of this work, as they have to those of Washington and His Generals—saying that I foster a spirit of war. To such I have but one answer to make; the spirit of rebellion against oppression, and deadly hostility to it, I *design* to foster, and only hope to succeed. .

. . . To me the great question of freedom, which was battled out under Cromwell, afterwards under Washington, and then under Bonaparte, and which is now shaking Europe to its center, is *the question of the age*. Men have always been compelled to *hew* their way with their swords to freedom. It is a curious fact, and one of the anomalies our race presents, that those among us most opposed to war, are the very class whose ultra notions of freedom,—nay, radicalism on all questions of Church and State, which they push with all the energy which they possess,—must, just so far as they are successful, produce civil war and bloodshed."

Passing over the singular reasoning, by which, in the latter part of this passage, the writer attempts to sustain his position,

the fallacy of which any reader of common acuteness will detect for himself, we can not help remarking, that the anticipation that such descriptions as he has seen fit to give us in his battle scenes, will in any degree foster a spirit of war in his readers, seems to us quite imaginary. Whether, moreover, the "spirit of rebellion against *oppression*," which Mr. Headley is so anxious to excite, is likely to be at all fostered by his account of Oliver's cruel slaughter of the Irish, at Drogheda, an act without excuse, as it was without necessity, and by similar wholesale murders, is a question which may safely be left to the decision of our readers. Fearful, indeed, will be the spirit fostered by such exhibitions of such deeds! Mr. Headley has quoted a letter written by Cromwell to Colonel Walton, wherein he holds the following language in reference to the death of Walton's son: "Before his death he was so full of comfort that to Frank Russell and myself he could not express it—it was so great above his pain!" This he said to us: indeed, it was admirable. A little after he said one thing lay on his spirit. I asked him what that was? He told me it was '*that God had not suffered him any more to be the executioner of his enemies;*'" and exulting in this ferocious sentiment, which heathenism itself will scarcely tolerate, his spirit passed to its final account. And Hugh Peters, the familiar friend and tool of Cromwell, after the massacre at Drogheda, offered up a solemn thanksgiving that "none were spared." And such things are the very results spread upon Mr. Headley's pages, of that "Puritanism and Republicanism," of which Cromwell is the spotlesstype and representative. The spirit, which prompts and justifies deeds which can only spring from notions utterly opposed, not only to the spirit and doctrines of Christianity, but to the dictates of humanity itself, is designated as the "spirit of rebellion against oppression," which Mr. Headley would gladly foster, if he could!

Mr. Headley's assertions are often so extraordinary, that the merest school boy will be enabled to detect their intrinsic falsehood, and their singular inconsistency with each other. Speaking of the testimony on which a correct estimate of the character of Cromwell must be based, he ventures the dogma, "that as no two English authorities agree, it is not to be expected that he can agree with all." Now it is notorious, that there is a very close agreement in most particulars that are essential, in that class of English authorities, who, by the general verdict of historians, are most to be trusted. It is no new thing to attempt to set aside the solemn decisions of history, by the suppression of what is true, and the exaggeration

of what is doubtful. But in this case, the record is too legibly written to allow of such tampering, with any reasonable prospect of success, even when Mr. Headley has such able coadjutors in the attempt, as Carlyle and D'Aubigné.

Ludlow, Hollis, Hume, Clarendon, Godwin, Thurloe, Rushworth, Vaughan, are all "English authorities," who do not disagree very widely on essential particulars. And as for writers not English, leaving Mr. Headley and Dr. Cheever out of the question, we may safely put such historians as Rapin and Guizot, beside the "Vindication" of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné.

"I regard the struggle," says Mr. Headley "as one of civil and religious liberty, and not a contest about Creeds." In direct opposition to this, Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, regards the fearful commotions and sanguinary conflicts of the period, as being "in the main a direct struggle against Popery," and on this ground thus seeks to justify them: "If a traveler in self-defense slays a highway robber, the responsibility of bloodshed does not rest on him. In ordinary times his hand would have been pure from its stain. War is war, and calls, alas! for blood. In the days of Louis XIV and of the Stuarts, it was a real war that Popery waged against the British Islands." We will not at present inquire how these discordant views may be reconciled; neither have we space or inclination to enter here upon the discussion of the political and religious principles which led to the civil wars of the Revolution. That both were involved in the struggle, no one who is at all acquainted with the history of the times can question. And that from that struggle, notwithstanding all its inhuman atrocities and blood-guiltiness, the Providence of ALMIGHTY GOD, through that benevolent dispensation by which good is always produced out of evil, evolved the foundations of the fair and symmetrical fabric of British liberty, which was to receive its crowning stone in the Revolution of 1688, none can entertain a doubt. It was the misfortune of Charles, that with the high notions of prerogative transmitted to him from his predecessors, there were no settled constitutional principles to oppose him. The power of the crown and the rights of the subject were alike undefined. There is evidence enough to induce us to believe that neither Charles, nor his minister Laud, in those acts, which, when interpreted by the English Constitution as it was afterwards settled, are unquestionably arbitrary, unjust and oppressive, was conscious of any breach of the constitution; and that both were guiltless of any design against the liberties of the people, and the fundamental laws of the realm. In this view, much of the de-

clamation of such writers as Mr. Headley falls pointless to the ground. The assumption that a fixed determination to destroy the liberty of the subject, was the ruling motive in all the public conduct of the king, is without proof; and when it is put forward as the chief circumstance in the justification of Cromwell and his associates in putting him to death, it surely may strike us as an exceedingly weak proof of a bad cause. It is not true. The dread of Parliamentary encroachment, and the desire to transmit his prerogative unimpaired to his children, in all the points in which he sincerely believed that prerogative to consist, was, without question, the moving spring that actuated the king, and the ruling motive which shaped all his policy, and gave form and direction to his acts. Whether, as has been well remarked by an able writer, "these views implied any defect of intelligence and sagacity, is a distinct question: but assuredly, it would be most unreasonable to regard them as indications of a want of patriotism."

But the chief questions in agitation during the period of disorder in which Cromwell rose to power, were, as Dr. D'Aubigné has justly said, of a religious rather than a political nature. It was more a contest for Puritanism against the Church of England, than for civil liberty and the rights of property, against royal oppression, and the Edicts of the Court of High Commission. It was the aspect of the dangers with which Puritanism menaced the Church, in the bold attacks which it made upon its most sacred principles, and the rancor with which it ventured to assail its holiest usages, which alarmed the king, and caused him to sanction and carry out the sincere, vigorous, but sometimes mistaken policy of Archbishop Laud. It is only by keeping this in view that we can justly estimate the means by which Cromwell rose to power, or grasp the key which unlocks the true secret of his character. With some show of justice, Puritanism raised the cry of cruel oppression, and prolonged it with the hoarse complaints of religious and ecclesiastical despotism. But the infamous slander that it was the fixed design of Charles and Laud to overthrow Protestantism, and to lead the nation back to Popery, was the main instrument wherewith Cromwell, taking the lead in the wildest excesses of anarchy and fanaticism, not only overthrew the Church and the Government, but obtained the direction of the most daring minds. With the specious pretext of standing up for law and Protestantism, against the blackest despotism, and the determined encroachments of Popery, he acquired all the credit and reverence of a pure patriot and wise legislator, even though

every step of his ascent to the Protectorate was won by the violation of the very laws which he pretended to protect and maintain. In all the wild commotions excited by the desire of political and religious change, he pushed himself foremost; and his intimate knowledge of the character of men, with his rare tact of directing the excited passions of the fanatical people and soldiery to a particular object, and of governing the ambition of their leaders by making it subservient to his own, will account for his distinguished success.

It is of course difficult to ascertain precisely what were the views and motives with which he first entered Parliament as member for Huntingdon. That he came there a gloomy and bigoted Puritan, with the full conviction that the theology of Geneva comprised, as Dr. Merle D'Aubigné is fond of expressing it, the "entire Gospel," and that nine-tenths of it, at least, consisted in an intense hatred of Arminianism, (or Arminianism, as Mr. Headley is pleased to term it,) Prelacy and Popery, which Puritanism never failed to link together, is altogether probable, from what we know of the religious exercises through which he is said to have passed during the ten years previous, as he wandered, pale and dejected, along the gloomy banks of the Ouse, beneath a clouded sky.* And such Calvinism as his, was by no means of the quiet sort: its attitude in public affairs was always rampant, and its state that of being armed to the teeth, ready to spring upon the Church, with its murderous weapons, whenever an opportunity should be afforded for its assaults. "Great questions of state," observes Mr. Headley, "became lost in those of conscience." Conscience, indeed, was the pretext; but the rankest and sourest fanaticism, if it were nothing worse, shone out in the "savage glare" with which he represents Cromwell as fixing his defiant glance upon the king, and continually manifested itself in a rankling disaffection towards every person who moved in a sphere higher than his own, or who adopted measures which had not received his approbation. When admitted into Parliament, he kept his eyes constantly fixed on subjects of complaint and matters of grievance, and without having devised any particular scheme of reformation in Church or State, made no scruple to condemn all who had the management of political and ecclesiastical affairs. When asked on one occasion to express his sentiments in regard to these important points, and to declare openly what changes he might deem expedient, he replied:—"I can tell what I

* Carlyle. *Letters and Speeches*.—I. 68.

would *not* have, though I can not tell what I *would* have." And yet this is the man of whom Mr. Headley, almost literally echoing the language of Thomas Carlyle, and the author of the "Vindication," speaks as possessing a "just and unbiased mind, judging actions by their simple rule of right, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

The account given by Sir Philip Warwick of his first appearance in the House of Commons, is so significant that we can not forbear extracting it. He says:

"The first time that ever I took notice of him, was in the very beginning of the Parliament held in 1640. I came into the house one morning and perceived a gentleman speaking whom I knew not, very ordinarily apparelled, for it was a plain cloth suit which seemed to have been made by an ill country tailor; his linen was plain and not very clean, and I remember a speck or two of blood upon his little band, which was not much larger than his collar; his hat was without a hat-band; his stature was of a good size, his countenance swollen and reddish, his voice sharp and untunable, and his eloquence full of fervor, for the subject matter would not bear of much reason, it being in behalf of a subject of Mr Prynne's, who had dispersed libels against the Queen for her dancing, and such like innocent and courtly sports, and he aggravated the imprisonment of this man by the council table unto that height that one would have believed that the very government itself had been in great danger by it."

This notorious Prynne, whom the mistaken policy of the Court elevated from a crazy fanatic into a martyr, might safely have been allowed to go at large and rave at will, with his ears untouched; and it was for such cruel acts as his mutilation, that Charles and his Ministers deserved a proper degree of rebuke and chastisement.* But not content with

* To show more clearly what was the character of Prynne, we add, that Grey, in his answer to Neal, quotes a passage from Rushworth, which Neal had found it convenient to omit, as follows—"he, Prynne, hath therein (in his libel) written divers incitements to stir up the people to discontent, as if there were just cause to lay violent hands on the Prince." To show also the sort of attack which Prynne made upon the Church, Grey quotes his language. He, Prynne, calls the Church-music a bleating of brute-beasts. "Choristers," he says, "bellow the tenor as if they were oxen; bark a counter point like a kennel of dogs; roar a treble as if they were bulls; and grunt out a bass like a parcel of hogs." For proof that the Puritan Divines of that day actually stirred up the people against the person and life of their king, Grey quotes a large number of printed Sermons before the two Houses, of which the following from Maynard is a specimen. "Those mine enemies that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me; let me see them executed, *kings, rulers, people*, who conspire against the Lord, and against his anointed." Another preacher of that day, Love, addressed his congregation in these words—"Tis the sword, not disputes, nor treaties, that must end this controversy; therefore turn your plough-shares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears, to fight the Lord's battles, to avenge the blood of saints that hath been spilt. It must be avenged, either by us, or upon us; cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently; and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood." And yet these are the men held forth in these days as the great apostles of liberty of conscience!

stigmatizing the simple injustice and cruelty of these acts, Cromwell and his associates were ever diligent to press upon the excited people the false inference, that they were all indications of a deliberate and systematic attempt to destroy the Reformed religion and to introduce Popery. Guizot, himself a firm Protestant, has had the candor to expose this outrageous slander. During the earlier stages of his career in Parliament, he speaks of him as having been listened to in silence and with favor, amidst the great excitement of the House, because he denounced, in very furious and indifferent language, the indulgence of a Bishop to some obscure preachers, whose doctrine, as measured by the ravings of "Prynnes, Pym, and Bens," or the extreme section of the Puritanical factions, he denounced as "flat Popery." In the House, this was the constant string upon which he harped; while out of it, he was, according to Guizot, more deeply engaged than any other in the machinations of the Revolution. It was in its external business, in exciting the people, in watching, in denouncing, in tricking the royalists, that Oliver's activity and influence were more especially engaged.

The whole force of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné's "Vindication," as well as much of the lame special pleading of Mr. Headley, consists in the assumption that it was the design of Charles to destroy the Protestant religion, and to introduce Popery. We believe that a more false and wicked imputation has never been thrown out, wherewith to blacken the memory of sincere but misguided members of the Church of England, as the Reformation had left it. For we have the clear testimony of Abbot, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and brother of the Primate who preceded Archbishop Laud, as to what was the precise doctrine then stigmatized as "the *Popery*," which Charles and Laud sought to introduce. Abbot himself being a warm preacher of the Genevan theology, says:—

"In the points of *free-will*, justification, concupiscence being a sin after baptism, *inherent righteousness* and *certainty of salvation*, the Papists can say they are wholly theirs. Might not CHRIST say, What art thou? Romish or English? Papist or Protestant? Or, what art thou, a mongrel compound of both; a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of *free-will*, *inherent righteousness*, and the like? A Protestant in receiving the sacrament, a Papist in the doctrine of the sacrament?"

On this pointed passage it has been well observed, that according to the views of Abbot and the Puritanical faction, the infallible symptoms of *Popery* were nothing more nor less than to exalt the Eucharist above a mere act of commemoration;—to maintain the freedom of the human will, and to

doubt that the elect were favored with a perfect assurance of salvation. Every step *from* Geneva, was held to be *towards* Popery. All who were not fixed and stationary at Geneva, were denounced as meditating a desertion towards Rome. Now it is precisely by the reiteration of such artifices as these that Merle D'Aubigné, in his "Vindication," endeavors to fix the character of Papist upon Charles, to substantiate his charge that in all the struggle which ended in his murder, "Protestantism was on its trial," and of course to elevate Cromwell into a champion of God's truth against man's error.

We have proof sufficient of the sincere and ardent attachment of Charles to the pure Protestantism of the Church of England.

One of the historians of the period, whose testimony is the more valuable as his prejudices are against the King, relates an occurrence which took place at Oxford, which affords to our mind the most decisive proof on this important point. The King, during his stay, was about to participate in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, administered by the hands of Archbishop Usher. Before the prelate proceeded to administer the sacred symbols of our redemption, his Majesty rose from his knees, and making a sign to the Archbishop for a short pause, said: "My Lord, I espy here many resolved Protestants, who may declare to the world the resolution I now make. I have, to the utmost of my power, prepared my soul to be a worthy receiver; and may I so receive comfort by the blessed Sacrament, as I intend the establishment of the true reformed Protestant religion, as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth, without any connivance at Popery. I bless God that in the midst of these public distractions, I have still liberty to communicate; and may this Sacrament be my damnation, if my heart do not join with my lips in this protestation."

We envy not the man, who, with the knowledge of this and similar circumstances, can pronounce Charles a foe of Protestantism, actuated by the determined design of bringing the Church of England back to Popery. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné and Mr. Headley after him,—for on this point, the *ci-devant* Presbyterian Clergyman, appears to follow the leading of the Genevan Professor of Theology,—have either culpably overlooked these facts, or are strangely ignorant of them. If one of these suppositions is more charitable than the other, we are willing to accord the benefit of it to the author of the "Vindication;" but whether in either case he is fit to be trusted as an impartial historian, is a question which we may safely al-

low our readers to determine for themselves. We are aware, indeed, that in his view, every thing which is not exactly conformed to his own theory of the Christian Church, or to that peculiar idea of the "entire Gospel," which Oliver held and taught, and which Geneva yet maintains in its essential features, is without hesitation pronounced to be, in Cromwell's expressive phrase, "flat Popery." And although Charles lived and died a sincere Christian, in the bosom of the Church of England, professing almost with his last breath, his conviction of the corruptions of the Church of Rome, the vision of Popery which Dr. D'Aubigné has conjured up, so blinds his judgment and confuses his spiritual perception, that he does not hesitate to consider as a mere empty profession, the faith, whose blessed and peaceful light so cheered the monarch in his last days, amid all the sorrows he was called upon to endure, and under all the insults that were heaped upon him, as to call forth the admiration, even of his enemies.

"He nothing common did or said,
But calmly laid his royal head
Down as upon a bed."

But what shall we say, when we find the most infamous of the calumnies invented by the regicides, after the death of the King, to blacken his memory, deliberately repeated by Dr. D'Aubigné, and adduced in justification of his murder. If he is ignorant of the fact, that the falsehood of the charge in relation to what he terms the "perfidious designs" of Charles, as manifested in his instructions to the Earl of Glamorgan, the agent of the King in Ireland, has been again and again refuted and exposed, he is certainly unfit for the very serious task he has undertaken. Whether ignorant or not, there never was a blacker calumny invented by an unprincipled faction, or propagated with more fierce and determined malignity. Our space will not allow us to go into the consideration of the question here, but we shall have occasion to bring the proof before our readers in a future number of the Review, on a subject closely connected with that under our present consideration.

We come now to the mournful history of the intrigues, the plots, and counter plots, the private knavery and fair show of public zeal on the part of the violent portion of the republicans, which ended with the death of the King. In all these dark movements, Cromwell was the master spirit. We are told of a prayer meeting at Windsor, held by the army leaders in the beginning of the year 1648, in which were gathered

the "longest heads, and strongest hearts in England." "It is a striking spectacle," exclaims Dr. D'Aubigné, "to witness the bold and formidable leaders of the Parliamentary army assembled for three days in prayer in the palace, to seek for the guidance of the Lord." "No one," observes Mr. Headley, "can reflect on the conclusion they came to, and the manner it was reached, without being deeply struck with the religious spirit that animated those brave hearts. Call it fanaticism, folly, impious confidence, any thing,—it is certainly not *hypocrisy*."

The result of this prayer meeting is given in the following words of Adjutant General Allen, whose report is quoted at length in the *Vindication* :

"We were enabled, then, after serious seekings of the Lord's face, to come to a very clear and joint resolution, that it was our duty to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood he had shed, and mischief he had done to the utmost against the Lord's cause and people in these poor nations."

The death of "Charles Stuart, that man of blood," was, therefore, resolved upon. It was to be accomplished by the members of this "prayer meeting," as speedily as possible, with such means and instruments as they could command, judicial or extra-judicial, by a civil sentence or a military decree, as might be most available.

From this meeting Cromwell goes out satisfied that the execution of this "very clear and joint resolution" of the army leaders must mainly rest upon him. By *his* intrigues, the door was closed against the reconciliation of the unhappy monarch with the Parliament, nor did he scruple to make use of a Clergyman of the Church of England for this purpose, who, being a devoted royalist, was commissioned to advise Charles by all means to reject the propositions of Lords and Commons, and to throw himself upon the army, whose leaders, as he was told, were ready to replace him in the full exercise of his authority, upon certain simple conditions. "Having once sworn to deceive," says Godwin, one of Cromwell's most determined apologists, in relation to his conduct and that of Ireton, in these base negotiations, made under the show of friendship to the King, "the dimensions of their minds enabled them immediately to stand forth accomplished and entire adepts in the school of Machiavel. They were satisfied that the system they adopted was just, and they felt no jot of humiliation or self-abasement in the systematical pursuit of it. *Hypocrisy* was of the very essence of every thing they could effect. Yet Ireton was a man of stern integrity,

and Cromwell had hitherto been remarked for his extraordinary frankness. But both had persuaded themselves that a certain degree of reserve and *deception* was necessary to accomplish a people's safety and effect the noblest ends." This testimony, from a source so friendly to Oliver, strengthened as it is by cotemporary writers, and fully confirmed by what we can not but consider the impartial investigations of Guizot, can not be overthrown by the declamation of Mr. Headley, the special pleading of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, or the picturesque romancing of Thomas Carlyle. The same author informs us how deeply the machiavelism, to give it no harsher name, of Oliver was engaged in the whole business of betraying, and eventually sacrificing the King. "The King rejected the propositions, for *he* prompted him to do so. The courtiers, for the same reason, advised him to that proceeding; the most powerful of the Presbyterians left London at a certain moment for the army, for Cromwell and Ireton drove and lured them to that extremity: *they*, to a certain degree, even made use of, and temporized with the members who had sat in Parliament during the absence of the speaker; *their* agents undertook by rude violence and force to compel the superior officers of the army to adopt that line of policy." In short, by Cromwell's encouragement, the soldiers were excited to rage and mutiny—the Parliament was brow-beaten, in order that a pretext might be afforded for breaking faith with the King, and ultimately for bringing him to the block. It was with the knowledge of some of these machinations that some who had once been his most intimate friends, advised Berkeley, the agent and confederate of Charles in the negotiations, to be on his guard against Cromwell. "For," said they, "he is a man on whom no one can rely; who changes his language and conduct every day to every person, wholly absorbed with the desire of being at all events, let what may occur, the leader of the successful party."

There was, indeed, scarcely any length, in that deception which Godwin undertakes to defend, to which Oliver did not proceed. The history of the seizure of the king by cornet Joyce, acting under secret orders from Cromwell, and of the after conduct of the latter, who was thrown into suspicion by it, is a melancholy case in point. With wonderful coolness, Mr. Headley tells us that *he* has taken some pains "to trace" Guizot's very clear and masterly statement "to its source." Unfortunately, however, for his reputation, several of the works which he has quoted in his preface, as having been diligently consulted by him, have given abundant evidence to

prove that the facts of the case do *not* "rest solely on Grimston's—the accuser's declarations"—but upon the testimony of Hollis, Herbert, and Warwick, to say nothing of Rushworth and Harris. This amazing inconsistency makes it exceedingly doubtful to us whether Mr. Headley has ever consulted him. At any rate, the flail which he has undertaken to wield has come down with a most sonorous concussion upon his own luckless head. Let all future compilers of "historical memoirs" of his stamp, beware.

When the King was placed, by the bold arrest of Joyce, in his own power, Cromwell hastened back to Parliament and took his seat. Every eye was turned upon him, for "every soul felt that he was at the bottom of this deep-laid plan." He was accused by Grimston with what he had uttered a short time before, at a meeting of his officers, that the army ought to be employed to purge the House of Commons. He did not attempt to set aside this evidence by that of his officers, which, if the fact were not true, could have been obtained at least from some of their number; but "when the accusers were withdrawn," forthwith fell upon his knees, and "after a passion of tears, with a vehemence of sobs, words and gestures, that filled the whole assembly with emotion or astonishment, poured forth invocations and fervent prayers, invoking upon his head every curse of God, if any man in the kingdom was more faithful than he to the House."

It was not long after this singular exhibition of his powers, that the threat which the evidence thus adduced fixed upon him, *was* executed, and Col. Pride did "*purge*" the house of its refractory members, by the kind of medicine which fiery Hugh Peters,* calls the "argument of the sword." All the honest and independent members were thus driven out, and those that remained,—a "servile and contemptible few," who won for themselves the name of "Pride's dray horses," from the fact, that Pride had once been a drayman,—were ready for any thing. And yet, even in their presence, Oliver spake in the following strain: "Sir," said he, addressing the Speaker, "if any man whatever have carried on this design of deposing the King, and disinheriting his posterity, or if any man *have still* such a design, he must be the *greatest traitor and*

* The curious reader will be somewhat amused in tracing several points of resemblance between Hugh Peters and Mr. Headley. Both being preachers—both devoted to the wildest doctrines of Puritanism—and both acknowledging the "power of the sword" as God's chosen instrument in effecting all civil and religious freedom.

rebel in the world. But since the Providence of God has cast this upon us, I can not but submit to Providence, though I am not yet prepared to give you my advice." And yet, this was the man, who went out from the prayer meeting at Windsor, fully determined, unless he were *then* a most profound hypocrite, to procure the deposition and condemnation of the King. This was the man, who had pursued that fell design by all the arts of intrigue, by cajolery, by deceit, by violence. This was the man, who commissioned Col. Pride to administer his potent "purge" for this object, and yet, in this speech of "*moral confusion*," as it has been most aptly designated, while he seeks shelter against the personal consequences of his acts by an *IF*, yet has the wickedness to assert, that although the man who should even *think* of dethroning the King was a traitor and rebel, *IF* providence laid the work on him, it would be another matter. To some readers, this speech may appear to be but a specimen of the studied nonsense and unintelligible cant, wherewith Oliver was so often successful in blinding the perception of his cotemporaries. To others, the intense fire of deep-scheming villainy will shine out from under the smoke. But on the most charitable supposition, which we ourselves are inclined to adopt, it shows the utter confusion and hollowness, as far as Christian morality goes, of a religion, which would allow him, while asserting it to be a high *crime* to depose the King, at the same time to justify any man in committing that crime, who should plead a *providential* call to it, resulting from what Dr. Merle D'Aubigné calls a "*particular faith*," thus making God the author of sin.

We need not dwell upon the conduct of Cromwell during the King's trial, conduct which can only be explained by the fact, that he was anxious by every means in his power, to hurry matters to an issue, and to cut off every hope of rescue. Guizot, after a patient and diligent examination of his authorities, tells us plainly, that although he "still hypocritically affected moderation, he alone was in reality more eager for it than any other person." Relying on the evidence of Ludlow and the State trials, he adds, that when the King was announced as approaching the chamber set apart for his trial, "Cromwell ran to the windows and *turning round very pale but very animated*, 'My masters, he is come! he is come!' he cried, 'and now we are doing that great work the nation will be full of. Therefore, I desire you to let us resolve here what answer we shall give the King when he comes before us, for the first question which he will ask us, by what au-

thority and commission we do try him.” This cold, deliberate foresight is quite of a piece with his brutal conduct during the scene, convincing us that here, at least, the mask was quite thrown off in the “animation” produced by the near prospect of success to his machinations. He attempted to brow-beat the reluctant judges who hesitated to sign the death warrant, and when he had written his own name,—the third on the list,—he proved the perfect hardness of heart by which the atrocious deed was done, by “drawing his pen,” to quote Mr. Headley, who, for once is quite correct, “across Marten’s face, besmearing it with ink, which practical joke was returned by the latter.”

We make no controversy with the eulogists of Cromwell, concerning the qualities which distinguished him as a statesman and a ruler. We are willing to subscribe to much of their panegyrics, upon the wisdom and efficiency of both his foreign and domestic policy. We admit that the condition of England during his protectorate, was one of high prosperity, and that his administration exceeded in influence and substantial glory, that of the reign of any British Monarch since the times of Henry the Eighth. Abroad, his government was respected and his alliance courted: at home, he kept his position and maintained his sway by means of flattery and intimidation; fomenting the mutual fears and hatred of the several parties, and employing them to his own advantage, even courting the Roman Catholics, by holding out the hope of legislation in their favor; until, as Bishop Burnet says, “he with great dissimulation carried things with all sorts of people, further than was thought possible, considering the difficulties he met with in all his Parliaments; although it was generally believed that his life and all his arts were exhausted at once, and that if he had lived much longer he could not have held things together.”

The representation given of his character in the life by Mr. Headley, the Vindication by Dr. D’Aubigné, and the remarks of Mr. Carlyle, is, therefore, in our view, essentially defective and untrue. It is not sustained by the history of the times, and can only be maintained by silencing the voice of historical truth, or by gross perversion of historical facts. And in arriving at this conclusion, we are not conscious of prejudice against him on account of the religious system which he professed; much less on account of the political principles which he advocated. We have endeavored to judge him by his *actions*, as they illustrate or contradict his *professions*. With the political errors of the King we have

no sympathy. We deny not the wrongs and sufferings of the people of England, in a period, when with the universal movement in favor of liberty, neither their rights, nor the prerogative of the crown were sufficiently defined, to provide a sufficient bulwark against tyranny on the one hand, or anarchy on the other. But the proceedings of Cromwell and the violent factions which he led, were neither in accordance with republican principles, with the eternal laws of justice and order, nor with the plain teaching of the Word of God. And the wickedness of their course was most awfully manifested in the putting of the King to death; an act, which, as it was unnecessary for securing the safety or rights of the subject, as nothing was attained by it, and as it essentially retarded the cause of freedom in England, was nothing more nor less than a wicked murder,—a murder, perpetrated against the will of the great mass of the people, by the mere mockery of a Parliament, overawed by military despotism.

There is evidence enough to satisfy us, that at the commencement of his career, however his judgment may have been perverted, and his religious feelings blunted by the narrow and gloomy Puritanism of the day, Cromwell was honest and sincere. In fighting so earnestly against the supposed design of the court to introduce Popery, while Popery was understood to consist in whatever was not Puritanism, he was combating a phantom, which to his mind, "as he wandered gloomily on the banks of the Ouse," to quote Mr. Carlyle, wore to him the appearance of a real enemy. Judging himself at liberty to inflict whatever inroads he could upon this monster, in the persons of its supposed abettors, he at length seems to have held it to be a religious duty to put *them* down, *per fas et nefas*; practically adopting the leading principle of Jesuitism, that the end sanctifies the means. And in this, we are sorry to observe that Dr. Merle D'Aubigné not only sustains him, but in his "Vindications," imitates his example, and makes use of the nefarious principle on his own account—unconsciously, we believe,—but no less truly and fully.

But the praise of sincerity, we think, can be justly accorded to Cromwell, only during the early part of his career. Subsequent events, while they made him both a soldier and a statesman, showed him the path by which the wildest dreams of *worldly* ambition might be realized, and he himself be enabled to attain to supreme power in England. The temper of his virtue was not strong enough to resist the edge of this great temptation. He plunged into the struggle, and from that period stopped at nothing which could aid him onward. And the result was the attainment of all he desired, at the

sacrifice of that which, as a Christian man, he should have most valued. Yet Dr. D'Aubigné remarks, "It is seldom that a great man is a Christian; but Cromwell was both; the result has been that men of the world have scouted him as a hypocrite." Alas, for human consistency! *who*, we ask, were these *men of the world*? Were they Churchmen,—loyal and pious sons of the Church of England, exclusively? We waive the testimony of such, because the Genevan Professor might doubt *their* Christianity, and possibly insist that all such are mere godless men of the world. Were they not such men as Ludlow, Hollis, Lilburn? such women as Mrs. Hutchinson? and these, surely, according to our author's views, were in precisely the same religious condition as Cromwell; they relied upon the very same evidences of piety and holiness as he did, and gave, according to the very standard which Dr. D'Aubigné holds up as the "entire Gospel," the same proof that they were "begotten of God." Will he designate these as "men of the world?" And yet, it is by a comparison of what they relate of Cromwell's actions, compared with his own professions, that unprejudiced men arrive at the estimate of his character which we have attempted to express.

We will not lift the veil from the last days of Cromwell, nor attempt to depict him under the influence of that "perpetual dread of assassination which haunted his private hours, compelled him to surround himself with a body-guard, to wear a shirt of mail, to carry loaded pistols in his pocket, and to change his bed-room almost nightly." We have said nothing of the agony of conscience under which he writhed when reproached by his dying daughter with the murder of the King. And there is a more fearful picture still, when, amidst the howling of a tempest, "such as had never been known in England," his soul passed to its last account, concerning which we need add nothing to the words of Echard, who, speaking of his last hours, said:—still he was not altogether without reflection, and seemed, above all, concerned for the reproaches which men would cast upon his name, in trampling upon his ashes when he was dead. Nor did he seem to be totally without religious apprehensions; and one great inquiry he had to make was, as we are told from Dr. Goodwin, "*whether a man could fall from grace.*" And when the Doctor answered in the negative, according to the prevailing notion, he replied—"then I am safe, for I am sure I was once in a state of grace."

In making his own reflections upon these facts, the reader will scarcely fail to think of the calm, peaceful, and truly saint-like demeanor of him who, although put to death by

Cromwell as "a tyrant, traitor, and murderer, and held up by Dr. D'Aubigné as one whose religion was mere emptiness and vanity, never once failed in his darkest hours of danger, to exhibit the holy and humble fortitude of the true Christian. The last days of Cromwell were all gloom and mistrust—those of Charles Stuart were full of light, and peace, and holy hope. 'This is my second marriage-day,' he said on the morning of his execution, 'for before night I hope to be espoused to the blessed Jesus. I fear not death; I bless my God I am prepared.' 'I have on my side a good cause and a merciful God'—he said to his venerable friend, Bishop Juxon, on the scaffold—"I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where I shall have no trouble to fear.'"

"Cromwell died," says Dr. D'Aubigné, "*in peace and serenity of soul*." This was the inscription upon his coffin-plate, and the fact that it establishes is more glorious to the Protector than all the parade of velvet pall and funeral torches." The "*fact*" is more than doubtful, as we have seen from the testimony which is most reliable in the case—testimony which has never been disputed, and which the author of the "*Vindication*" most strangely suppresses. From this specimen we may be allowed to judge of his book.

We are not among those who hold that the life of a Christian man may always be interpreted by the spirit which he manifests on his death-bed. We rather believe that, through the infirmities of nature, and the temptations of the great adversary of souls, darkness is sometimes allowed to becloud the spiritual vision of the holiest of mortals, and that even such may go out of the world with tremblings of heart, though never in unbelief and despair. Dr. D'Aubigné and Mr. Headley have, however, both triumphantly pointed to Cromwell's death-bed, as a proof of the perfect sincerity and integrity of his religious character, and both have neglected to mention the singular fact that the foundation of the peace and serenity of soul he is said to have enjoyed, lay in a *Calvinistic dogma*, that a man can never "fall from grace." We have contrasted his death with that of the man whose life was sacrificed, in his grasping after sovereign power, without remorse and without pity on his part. And since the canonizers of the Protector have so boldly put forward the death-bed as the final test of Christian character, we are willing that the world should judge, by this test, which was the true Christian, and which the hypocrite. And by this test, whatever may have been the errors of Charles Stuart, we can add fervently, in contemplating his end, so holy, so humble, so serene—*Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.*

THE CATACOMBS OF ROME.

ART. VI.—*The Church in the Catacombs*: a description of the Primitive Church of Rome, Illustrated by Sepulchral Remains. By CHARLES MAITLAND, M. D. London: 1846.

THERE is an old Arabian fable, of a city whose inhabitants in an instant were turned to stone. The maiden at the fountain—the guest in the hall—the listless wanderer in the streets—all were arrested without a moment's warning, and in the posture in which the stroke found them, were transmuted at once into marble statues. And there the city stood in the desert, with the stillness of the grave resting on it, every thing unchanged as age after age swept over it. At last came a chance traveler, and for the first time in centuries its deserted streets echoed to the tread of human footsteps, as he wandered on through palace, and temple, and hall, with none to answer his summons—none to oppose his entrance—gazing in wonder on the memorials of generations which had lived ages before, to the possession of which none had succeeded, and, therefore, they had remained unaltered.

In our day, the deserted cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii almost furnish a reality to this fable. There, we are at once transported back to the first century of the Christian era. We enter houses which it seems as if the lordly Roman had but just quitted. His paintings, and statues, and manuscripts, are about us. The sentinel still stands at the post he dared not leave, even when the burning cinders were raining about him, and the skeleton rattles hollow in his armor—the strigil lies on the pavement of the bath, as the frightened slave dropped it, when he fled—and in the bedroom is the *rouge* with which the faded beauty of Pompeii once restored her charms. We see on all sides of us, the nature of that now forgotten civilization, which spreads its charm over these gay Campanian cities. The “great gulf” which separates us from the days of Pliny is bridged over. The intervening ages are forgotten. We live among those who for nearly eighteen centuries have been dust—we understand each arrangement of their domestic life—and it requires an effort to recall our minds to the realities of the living present.

What these long buried cities display to us of the social condition of the ancients, the Catacombs reveal with regari

to the Church of that day. While we often read in the remains of Pompeii, a commentary on the lines of Juvenal or Horace, in the inscriptions which mark the tombs of the early Christians, we find a confirmation of much that was written by the Fathers of the first three centuries. The same spirit pervades these records graven in the rock, and the earnest words which these leaders of the Church sent forth to cheer their converts in the faith. The two harmonize in tone, and remain to rebuke the changes which after ages gradually brought about.

But the investigations of the Catacombs have been hitherto locked up from the great body of the public. The first publication on this subject was the work of Bosio, who had spent thirty years in its preparation. Yet he died before its completion, and it was edited by Severano, in the year 1632, under the title of *Roma Sotterranea*. The same work translated into Latin, and still further enlarged, was republished by Arringhi. Fabretti, who held the office of curator of the Catacombs, published a number of Epitaphs, and eighteen years afterwards another folio issued from the hands of his successor, Boldetti, entitled "Osservazioni sopra i cimiterii dei Santi Martiri." The last that appeared was the "Sculpture e Pitture" of Bottari, which was devoted more especially to the Christian Arts. These works, however, though abounding in theological and antiquarian information, were written either in Latin or Italian, and of course useless to many who wished information on the subject.

The work we have placed at the head of this article, is the first attempt to bring this matter within the reach of the mere English reader. We confess, however, that we do not think very highly of it. The author seems to have felt very little enthusiasm for his subject; and we can not conceive how any one, with the rich materials of Arringhi and Bottari before him, could have made so little of his theme. We think that most persons would rise from a perusal of the volume with a feeling of dissatisfaction. In addition to this, it is written too much in the book-making style, filled with discussions, which, although well enough in themselves, are out of place in a work where the subject is so wide that every page is needed to give even an outline. For instance, in treating of the inscriptions on the tombs of the Martyrs, *forty-seven* pages are used in a discussion of martyrdom in general, with accounts of those sufferings of the early Christians, which are familiar to every reader of Ecclesiastical History. This, in a book of only about three hundred

pages, is rather too great a waste of space, which might have been much more profitably employed. Dr. Maitland's work might, therefore, be cut down to almost one half its present size, and still contain all the information it now does about "the Church in the Catacombs."

We propose, as far as the narrow space of this article will admit, to give some account of these burial places of the early disciples of our faith, deriving our materials partly from the works we have enumerated above, and partly from personal recollection. In the struggle for the truth which now is waging—in that controversy we have with Rome, as to which holds the doctrines of the Primitive Church—we can appeal to these enduring inscriptions, written above the dust of the early Martyrs, and show, that though dead they still speak as we do, and prove the identity of the faith we hold, with that for which Apostles suffered.

About two miles from the gates of Rome, on that same Appian Way, over whose pavements once the legions of victorious Rome marched on their way to the Capitol, and whose stones were bedewed with the tears of captive Princes, as they were dragged along to swell the glory of the triumph, stands the Church of St. Sebastian. Adjoining is the Monastery of the same name, and around it, far as the eye can reach, stretches the desolate Campagna. Here is the usual entrance to the Catacombs. There is another opening, indeed, at the Church of St. Agatha, but for some reason, strangers are seldom permitted to enter it. The writer made many attempts while in Rome; but though several times promised admission by ecclesiastics, he never succeeded in effecting it. And such, he has found, was the testimony of all his friends. The only individual he has met with who was able to inspect the Catacombs of St. Agatha, was the late Thomas Cole, the Artist, from whom he received so interesting an account as to deepen his regret at his own failure. Mr. Cole represented these passages as being much richer in inscriptions and paintings than those of St. Sebastian, fewer having been removed from their original positions to be placed in the Gallery of the Vatican. Perhaps they bear more explicit testimony against the modern practices of Rome, and, therefore, are studiously kept concealed from the view of the curious.

There are, also, scattered over the Campagna, holes leading into the galleries below, which often prove dangerous to the incautious rider. D'Agincourt on several occasions availed himself of them to enter the passages. As they are

all found in the Christian part of the Catacombs, they are probably apertures made for air or light. In the Acts of the Martyrs we find them spoken of as the *luminaria cryptæ*.

Taking one of the Monks of St. Sebastian for your guide, from a Chapel of the Church you can descend by the well worn stone-steps into the Catacombs below ; and the contrast to the dark and damp caves, will be the greater from leaving the balmy Italian atmosphere above. Each member of the party furnished with a light, you follow your guide through intricate passages, which cross and re-cross, until he has gone his usual round and you are again at the foot of the steps. The passages wind around, apparently to follow the direction of the soft rocks, and the intricacy is increased by their generally being constructed in three stories, so that you constantly meet with steps which ascend or descend. They are usually not more than three feet wide, but at times they expand into Chapels, in one of which is still remaining a simple altar with an antique Cross in the rock above it. What solemn services must this spot have witnessed ! How earnest the prayers which were here poured forth by men, whose faith was certain because they had received it from the lips of Apostles themselves, and glowed more brightly because they stood in jeopardy every hour ! On each side of these passages are the tombs—excavations in the soft rock just large enough to contain a human body, and the cavity closed by a thin slab of marble. Sometimes the sepulchres are single, while in other places children are buried, as if a whole family had been interred on the same spot. Some of these have never yet been opened ; but their buried inmates repose as they were laid to their rest in the first ages of our faith. In one case the marble has cracked, and inserting a thin taper, you can look on the mouldering remains of one who perhaps saw our LORD Himself in the flesh. Boldetti relates, that an odor of spices was perceived on opening some of these graves, and in the lateral branches of the Catacombs, he found unfinished sepulchers, or intended ones merely sketched upon the walls.

On the slabs which closed the tombs, were cut the Christian emblems, which the early followers of our LORD so much delighted to use, and there too they scrawled the brief epitaphs by which in that age of fear and persecution they marked the resting place of their brethren. Every thing around speaks of the consecration of suffering, and of the simple earnest faith of men, with whom the glories of the next world had swallowed up all the pains of their brief

mortal pilgrimage. How far these passages extend is not known. They are said by some to reach from sixteen to twenty miles; but a small part only is now shown, in consequence of accidents which have taken place from persons losing their way, or the galleries caving in. Many of the lateral passages about St. Sebastian have been closed, yet still, should a sudden gust of air extinguish the lights of a party, it would not be very easy for them to trace their way out.

We can find allusions to these caves long before the Christian era. The great increase of Rome in the later days of the Republic, led to the working of quarries in the immediate neighborhood to procure the materials necessary for building. The soil of the Campagna rests on tufa and puzzolana, a volcanic, sandy rock, easily quarried, and from its texture well adapted to the excavation of long galleries, while the Esquiline Hill was undermined to obtain sand for making cement. Thus the whole sub-soil on one side of the city of the Cæsars, was perforated by a net-work of excavations, stretching out for miles in crypts and galleries. These subterranean works were referred to by Cicero in his oration for Cluentius, when Asinius, a young Roman citizen, was inveigled to the gardens of the Esquiline, and precipitated into one of the sand-pits—"in arenarias quasdam extra Portam Esquilinam." It was too in these caverns, Suetonius tells us, Nero was afterwards advised to conceal himself in his hour of danger; on which occasion he made answer to his freedman Phaon, "that he would not go under the ground while living."

Then came the advent of the Christian faith. The *arenarii* or sand diggers, and the workmen in the quarries, were persons of the lowest grade, and, from their occupation, probably formed a distinct class. There is reason to suppose that Christianity spread very early among them; (were not its first followers every where the lowest in the social scale?) for in time of persecution, the converts employed in the subterranean passages not only took refuge there themselves, but also put the whole Church in possession of these otherwise inaccessible retreats. And may we not trace in all this the hand of a protecting Providence? The Church was about to enter the furnace of affliction, and to be encircled by the rage of the adversaries; here, then, had previously been provided a sure refuge, where it could abide until the storm was overpast. This was the cradle of the infant community. And perhaps we may go a step farther, and

assert, that while the Church in Rome owed much of the rapidity of its triumph to the protection afforded by the Catacombs, as an impregnable fortress, from which persecution always failed to dislodge it, it was to the preservation of these, its earliest sanctuaries, that it was indebted for its ancient superiority in discipline and manners. That the Catacombs were, throughout, well known to the early Christians, is evident; for every part bears traces of their occupancy. We meet on all sides with tombs and Chapels, paintings and inscriptions, and for three hundred years the entire Christian population of Rome found sepulture in these recesses.

St. Jerome speaks of them in the middle of the fourth century. "When I was at Rome"—says the Monk of Palestine—"still a youth, and employed in literary pursuits, I was accustomed, in company with others of my own age, and actuated by the same feelings, to visit on Sundays the sepulchres of the apostles and martyrs, and often to go down into the crypts dug in the heart of the earth, where the walls on either side are lined with the dead; and so intense is the darkness, that we almost realize the words of the Prophet, 'They go down alive into Hades.' Here and there a scanty aperture, ill deserving the name of a window, admits scarcely light enough to mitigate the gloom which reigns below; and as we advance through the shades with cautious steps, we are forcibly reminded of the words of Virgil, 'Horror on all sides; even the silence terrifies the mind.'"^{*}

The Acts of the Martyrs relate many attempts made by the persecutors of the early Christians, to trace them in these retreats. But the entrances were so numerous, scattered for miles over the Campagna, and the labyrinths below so complicated, and blocked up in various places, that pursuit generally was useless. At other times, from above they overwhelmed the galleries with mounds of earth, to destroy those who were concealed within. Occasionally these efforts were successful, and the Catacombs became not only the burial place of the martyrs, but also the scene of their last sufferings. In the time of Cyprian, Xystus, Bishop of Rome, together with Quartus, one of his clergy, poured out their blood on this spot; and Stephen, another Bishop of Rome, was traced by the heathen soldiers to his subterranean Chapel. At the conclusion of the service, he was thrust back into his Episcopal chair, and thus beheaded. We do not take these instances from the ordinary accounts

^{*} Hieronymus in Ezechiel, c. xl.

of the martyrologists, where every thing is so often exaggerated. They are found in the letters of the early Christians, given with a simplicity which shows their truth. Even as late as the year 352, during a temporary persecution by the Arians, Liberius, Bishop of Rome, took up his abode in the Cemetery of St. Agnes.

But three centuries passed by, and Christianity emerging, from these recesses, walked boldly on the soil, beneath which she had so long been glad to seek concealment. Yet ere long, the flood of barbarian invasion rolled over Italy, and amid the disorders which ensued, these sanctuaries of the ancient Church were gradually forgotten. It required constant use to preserve a knowledge of their intricate windings, and therefore a few only of the principal entrances were kept open. Even these gradually became neglected and blocked up by rubbish, until the Church scarcely remembered her ancient home. It was not until the sixteenth century that the entire range of the Catacombs was re-opened, after being untouched for more than a thousand years. Then, when the revival of letters enabled the learned to profit by the discovery, investigations commenced, which have been prosecuted to the present day, as the question has been agitated, whether Rome shall be permitted to claim identity in discipline and doctrine with those ancient disciples, who have thus bequeathed to us the memorials of their faith and sufferings.

Such is the history of these Catacombs. Within the last few years, most of the inscriptions have been removed to a Hall of the Vatican—the Lapidarian—where, to the number of more than three thousand, they are fastened to the wall.* Opposite to them are ranged in the same way, the monumental inscriptions of Pagan Rome, gathered from other places. "I have spent"—says Raoul Rochette—"many entire days in this sanctuary of antiquity, where the sacred and profane stand facing each other, in written monuments preserved to us, as in the days when Paganism and Christianity, striving with all their powers, were engaged in mortal conflict. And were it only the treasure of impressions which we receive from this immense collection of Christian epitaphs, taken from the graves of the Catacombs, and now attached to the

* It is difficult to say how ancient some of these tombs are. Consular dates have been found, however, as early as A. D. 98, and as late as A. D. 400. During this time at least, the whole Christian population of Rome was interred there. As this period extends nearly a century after the establishment of Christianity under Constantine, the numbers must have been latterly very great.

walls of the Vatican, this alone would be an inexhaustible fund of recollections and enjoyment for a whole life.”*

It is interesting to mark the difference between the two sides of the gallery. The proud titles of Roman citizenship—the funeral lamentations—the traces of complicated political orders—are all neatly engraved; while the record of the Christians is often contained in an incoherent sentence, or a straggling mis-spelt scrawl, which betrays in its very execution, haste and ignorance. The latinity of these epitaphs would shock a classical reader—the orthography is generally faulty—the letters irregular—and the sense not always obvious. The first glance at the Christian side is enough to show, that, as St. Paul expresses it, “not many mighty, not many noble,” were numbered among those, who, in the first age of our faith, were here laid to their rest. Such is the inscription:

τοπος φιλεμονος

“The place of Philemon.”

Roughly carved upon a slab, over which its letters straggle with no attention to order, it tells plainly that it was placed there by the members of a persecuted and oppressed community.

There is, too, a simplicity in most of these inscriptions, which does not mark the monuments of their adversaries. We copy a few of these:

BIRGINIVS PARVVM
STETIT AP. N.

“Virginus remained but a short time with us.”

VALERIA DORMIT IN PACE.

“Valeria sleeps in peace.”

MARTYRIA
IN PACE.

“Materia in peace.”

VIDALIO IN PACHE †

“Vidalio, in the peace of Christ.”

But it is in the spirit of these inscriptions that we chiefly mark the contrast of our faith to that old and *effete* religion which it supplanted. No hope beyond the grave sheds its light over the Pagan monuments. The expression, DOMVS ETERNALIS—“An eternal home”—constantly appears. It

* Tableau des Catacombs—p. 10.

is thus that the despair of a mother for her ^{first} infant child is shown in one of the inscriptions of the Lapidarian Gallery :

ATROX O FORTVNA TRV CIQVAE FVNERE GAVDES
QVID MIHI TAM SVBITO MAXIMVS ERIPITVR.

“O relentless Fortune, who delightest in cruel death,
Why is Maximus so early snatched from me !”

Even the noble philosophy of Greece seems to have left no trace in these epitaphs, nor do the glorious dreams of Plato, as he argued on the very verge of truth, seem to have dawned upon the minds of those who, in the Imperial City, thus laid the loved and lost in the tomb. A gloomy stoicism—a forced resignation—is the highest feeling we can discover. They turn to the life which is past, only with Epicurean regret, that its pleasures can be enjoyed no longer. Take, for instance, the anacreontic language in the following :

V· A· N· LVII·
D· M
TI· CLAVDI· SECVNDI
HIC· SECVM· HABET· OMNIA
BALNEA· VINVM· VENVS
CORRVMPVNT· CORPORA
NOSTRA· SED· VITAM· FACIVNT
B· V· V·

“To the Divine Manes of Titus Claudius Secundus, who lived 57 years. Here he enjoys every thing. Baths, wine, and love ruin our constitutions, but—they make life what it is.

Farewell : farewell.”

But no where can we trace any thing but calmness and peace among the inscriptions of the early Christians. Brief as they may be, they yet evidently look to a life beyond life. A light had risen to dispel the horror of darkness which had hitherto reigned over the grave ; and while the first disciples had before them a view of the Eternal City, it is no wonder they were willing even to rush through the gate of martyrdom, that they might enter its starry portals. Death was to them like sinking to a gentle slumber ; and often this is the only idea expressed in their short epitaphs.

DORMITIO ELPIDIS
“The sleeping place of Elpis.”
VICTORINA DORMIT
“Victorina sleeps.”

ZOTICVS HIC AD DORMIENDVM

"Zoticus laid here to sleep."

GEMELLA DORMIT

IN PACE.

"Gemella sleeps in peace."

Sometimes, too, they expressed still more fully their disbelief in the chilling doctrine of the annihilation of the soul, taught by Paganism, or the almost equally cheerless picture of an uncertain Elysium, which was the utmost that creed could teach them. Thus, in a portion of the epitaph which Placus recorded above his wife, Albana, he says :

RELICTIS TVIS IACES IN PACE SOPORE
MERITA RESVRGIS TEMPORALIS TIBI DATA
REQVETIO

"You, well-deserving one, having left your (relations,) lie in peace—in sleep. You will arise—a temporary rest is granted you."

With them, too, death was the admission into immediate joy. No visions of a Purgatory clouded the dying gaze of the early Roman Christians. They looked upon the soul as going at once to a place of refreshing, by means of God's presence. Epitaphs like this abound :

NICEFORVS ANIMA
DVLGIS IN REFRIGERIO.

"Neciphorus, a sweet soul, in the place of refreshment."

And is not this the same in its meaning as the following?

ARETVSA
IN DEO.

"Arethusa, in God."

Another, in memory of a child, contains the declaration :

ESSE IAMINTER INNOCNTIS COEPISTI

"You have already begun to be among the innocent ones."

Another employs the following paraphrase to mark the date of the death :

ACCERSITVS AB ANGELIS VII· IDVS IANVA

"Borne away by angels on the seventh Ides of January."

And can we suppose that this expression, used by our Lord to describe the passage of Lazarus to the Paradise above, was here intended to imply a conveyance to expiatory flames?

The absence indeed, of every feeling but those of trust and

hope, is most remarkable in these epitaphs. No word of bitterness is breathed even against their persecutors, by whom they were doomed to death. We distinguish the tombs of the martyrs, more by the emblems placed over them, than by the words of the inscriptions. We believe there is but a single instance of one representing a man torn in pieces by wild beasts. "To look at the Catacombs alone," says Rochette, "it might be supposed that persecution had there no victims, since Christianity has made no allusion to suffering." And then he goes on to contrast this spirit with that displayed in the adornment of some of the modern churches in Rome. "Perhaps I may be allowed to add, that a series of paintings, like those of St. Stefano in Rotondo, [a church in Rome,] filled with all the scenes of barbarity which the rage of executioners could devise, or the constancy of martyrs support, honors less the faith which inspires such images, or which resisted such trials, than the paintings of the Catacombs, generally so pure, so peaceful in their object and intention, where it seems that the gospel ought to have met with no enemies, appearing so gentle, so ready to forgive."*

Nor was the tone of these epitaphs changed when the days of persecution passed away, and the members of the Church were no longer obliged to eat the bread of life in secret, or drink the water of life mingled with bitter tears. No words of gratulation mark the inscriptions they recorded. They seemed in those solemn places to heed the world as little when it smiled upon them, as they did when suffering from its enmity. The Church was as little elated by triumph, as before it had been depressed by adversity.

There is another circumstance connected with these cemeteries, which we can not but notice. It is the fact, that Christianity first introduced the custom of common burial places for persons of every grade, and connected with each other only by the profession of the same faith. With the higher class of Pagans, sepulchers were appropriated only to the members of the same family—as the tomb of the Scipios—while Horace speaks with undisguised contempt of the "common sepulcher" which was intended for the dregs of the people. Even the history of each Jewish patriarch generally concludes with the declaration—"He was buried with his fathers." Christianity first broke down these narrow distinctions—introduced a nobler relationship than that of blood—taught that in CHRIST JESUS all are one; and here we find them sleeping

* *Tableau des Catacombes*, p. 194. This work is interdicted in Rome.

side by side, old men and children, young men and maidens, all claiming brotherhood to each other only in the Church of their LORD. See how in the two inscriptions which follow, the extremes of life are brought together. (We have taken the liberty in the first, to alter the Latin words, which otherwise from their barbarous forms would be almost unintelligible.)

† MARTYRIUS VIXIT ANNOS XCI
ELEXIT DOMUM VIVUS. IN PACE

“In CHRIST. Martyrius lived ninety-one years.
He chose this spot during his life. In peace.”

SPIRITO SANCTO
INNOCENTI QVI
VIXIT AN· PL· M· III.

“To the holy soul Innocens, who lived three years, more or less.” (plus, minus.)

But the places in the Catacombs which the members of the early Church regarded as invested with a peculiar consecration, were the graves of the Martyrs. “The noble army of Martyrs praise thee,” was early chanted in the Church at Milan; and in accordance with its spirit, the followers of our LORD have paid their highest honors to those who, in this warfare of faith, led the forlorn hope, and fell victorious. In these days of coldness, indeed, we are startled as we read the glowing accounts of the early martyrologists. They love to exhibit the sufferer as sustained by a lofty enthusiasm, which rendered him almost insensible to pain—as being engaged in a conflict in which he and the executioner were the combatants—“hinc martyr, illinc carnifex”—as Prudentius expresses it. In his own dissolving powers, the Martyr recognized the pledge of his victory. No group, indeed, of Oceanides were there to console the Christian Prometheus, yet, to his upturned eye, countless angels were visible—their anthem swept sweetly and solemnly to his ear—and the odors of an opening Paradise filled the air. Though the dull ear of sense heard nothing, he could listen to the invisible Coryphæus, as he invited him to Heaven, and promised him an eternal crown. It is in this spirit that Prudentius—to whom belongs the honor, in the fourth century, of introducing poetry into the literature of religion—makes his hero exclaim—

“Erras cruenta, si meam
Te rere pœnam sumere,
Quùm membra morti obnoxia
Dilancinata interficia.

"Est alter, est intrinsecus,
Violare quem nullus protest,
Liber, quietus, integer,
Exsors dolorum tristem.

"Hoc, quod laboras perdere
Tantis furoris viribus,
Vas est solutum ac fictile,
Quocumque frangendum modo."

"Tear, as you will, this mangled frame,
Prone to mortality ;
But think not, man of blood, to tame
Or take revenge on me.
You overlook, in thus supposing,
The nobler self that dwells within ;
Throughout these cruel scenes reposing,
Where naught that injures enters in.
This, which you labor to destroy
With so much madness, so much rage,
Is but a vessel formed of clay,
Brittle, and hastening to decay.
Let nobler foes your arms employ ;
Subdue the indomitable soul ;
Which, when fierce whirlwinds rend the sky,
Looks on in calm security,
And only bows to God's control."

Again, in another passage—for we can not forbear making a few extracts from one so little known, yet so lofty in his spirit—when describing the Proconsular records of the execution of Romanus, he takes occasion to compare them with the eternal records kept by CHRIST, commemorative of his servants' sufferings.

"Illas sed ætas conficit diutina,
Ulgo fuscatur, pulvis obducit situ,
Carpit senectus, aut ruinis obruit ;
Inscripta CHRISTO pagina immortalis est,
Nec obsolescit ullus in cœlis apex.
Excepit adstans angelus coram Deo,
Et quæ locutus Martyr, et quæ pertulit :
Nec verba solùm disserentis condidit,
Sed ipsa pingens vulnera expressit stilo,
Laterum, genarum, pectorisque, et faucium.
Omnis notata est sanguinis dimensio,
Ut quamque plagam sulcus exaraverit,
Altam, patentem, proximam, longam, brevem,
Quæ vis doloris, quive segmenti modus :
Guttam cruoris ille nullam perdidit."

"But these the dust and damp consume,
And time, in his destroying race,

Shall breathe upon the tragic scroll,
 And every mouldering line efface.
 There is a record traced on high,
 That shall endure eternally ;
 On whose everlasting page,
 Nought grows obsolete by age.
 The Angel, standing by God's Throne,
 Treasures there each word and groan ;
 And not the Martyr's speech alone,
 But every wound is there depicted,
 With every circumstance of pain,
 The crimson stream, the gash inflicted,
 And not a drop is shed in vain."

Even the murder of the Innocents calls forth one of his most splendid efforts :

" Salvete, flores martyrum,
 Quos lucis ipso in limine
 CHRISTI insecutor sustulit,
 Ceu turbo nascentes rosas.
 " Vos prima CHRISTI victima,
 Grex immolatorum tener,
 Aram ante ipsam simplices
 Palmâ et coronis luditis."
 " First fruits of Martyrs, hail !
 Whom in the dawning of life's day,
 The godless tyrant swept away,
 As storm the budding roses.
 But now before the altar high
 Each tender victim safe reposes,
 Pleased in that dread vicinity,
 With branch of palm and crown to play ;
 Though all unconscious of the prize,
 Themselves, CHRIST's earliest sacrifice."

When such a spirit prevailed in the Church, is it strange that the resting places of the Martyrs were marked, and became, as it were, a nucleus, around which other graves were gathered ? We have already said that but few among the thousands gathered here, plainly mention the manner of their death. As, however, it may be interesting to see the way in which this is done in these few exceptions, we will copy them.

†

LANNVS XPI MA
 RTIR HIC REQVIESC
 IT SUB DIOCLETIANO
 PASSVS

" Lannus, the Martyr of CHRIST, rests here. He suffered under Diocletian."

PRIMITIVS IN PACE QVI POST
 MVLTA ANGVSTIAS FORTISSIMVS MARTYR
 ET VIXIT ANNOS P. M. XXXVIII CONIUG. SVO
 PERDVLCISSIMO BENEMERENTI FECIT

"Primitius in peace : a most valiant Martyr after many torments. Aged 38. His wife raised this to her dearest well deserving husband."

The next shows, from its concluding sentence, that it was erected during a time of actual persecution. It has carved on one side of the inscription, the cross, and on the other, the palm branch.

† TEMPORE ADRIANI IMPERATORIS MA-
 RIVS ADOLESCENS DVX MILITVM QVI
 SATIS DVM VITAM PRO CHRISTO
 CVM SANGVINE CONSVNSIT IN PACE
 TANDEM QVIEVIT BENEMERENTES
 CVM LACRIMIS ET METV POSVERVNT
 I. D. VI.

"In CHRIST. In the time of the Emperor Adrian, Marius, a young military officer, who had lived long enough, when, with his blood, he gave up his life for CHRIST. At length he rested in peace. The well-deserving set up this with tears and in fear. On the 6th Ides of December."

There is another in Greek, to the memory of Gordianus, Deputy of Gaul, which states that "he was murdered, with all his family, for the faith;" and adds, that the inscription was set up by "Theophila, his handmaid."

But we remarked, it was chiefly through emblems rudely carved on the stone, that we can distinguish the graves of those who actually shed their blood for the faith. Yet these have furnished abundant materials for discussion to the antiquarian. Among them is the ungula, or hooked forceps, which is usually regarded as an instrument of torture, and specimens of which are shown in the Museum of the Vatican. Another is a hooked comb, which it is contended was used in tearing the flesh of the Martyrs. On this subject we can not of course pretend to decide, but will only observe, that this opinion is the one sustained by Arringhi and Boldetti, and that in the "Peristephanon" of Prudentius, these instruments are mentioned on every page.

We learn, indeed, from various sources, how precious to the early Church was the blood of her Martyrs. They esteemed the "baptism of blood" the surest passport to the Paradise above; and when Quirinus was sentenced to be

drowned, Prudentius, in lamenting his fate, thinks it necessary to vindicate his right to the honors of martyrdom, notwithstanding his death was without bloodshed.

"Nil refert, vitreò æquore,
An de flumine sanguinis
Tinguat passio Martyrem:
Aque gloria provenit,
Fluctu quolibet uvida."

"The deep cold waters close o'er one:
Another sheds a crimson river:
No matter; either stream returns
A life to the Eternal Giver:
Each tinges with a glorious dye
The Martyr's robe of victory."

Space would fail us were we to enter into a discussion of the numerous other emblems which are found in the Catacombs, not on the tombs of the Martyrs only, but on those of disciples, who through a more peaceful death entered into their reward. The Cross, the emblem of our common faith, is every where to be seen. Although so lately invested with the most humiliating associations, to the early Christians it became at once a mark of dignity and honor. Unlike but too many who, in this day, bear that holy name which was first assumed at Antioch, *they* gloried in the Cross. They used it as an emblem on all occasions during life,—for with them the Cross explained every thing,—and it consecrated their tombs when the conflict of life was over, and they had exchanged it for the Crown. In addition to this, were the Monogram of our SAVIOUR's name—the Alpha and Omega, taken from the passage in the Apocalypse—the Dove, to signify peace with God—the Anchor, emblematical of hope, or of the conclusion of a successful voyage—the Ship, to represent the Church—the Crown and Palm, which have been already noticed—the Stag, to show "the Hart which thirsteth after the water brooks"—the Hare, the timid Christian hunted by persecutors—the Lion, the emblem of the tribe of Judah—the Peacock and Phœnix, shadowing forth the resurrection.

One of the most common of these mystic signs, was the Fish. Sometimes its figure was represented, while at other times, in place of it was the Greek word $\rho\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, which first suggested the emblem, from its containing the initials of $\text{I}\eta\sigma\upsilon\varsigma\ \text{X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\circ\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \text{I}\eta\varsigma\ \Sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$, "JESUS CHRIST, SON of GOD, the SAVIOUR." An advantage attending this was, that the meaning of the emblem was entirely concealed from the uninitiated, who stood ready to ridicule and blaspheme. Per-

haps, too, there may have been some association like that which Tertullian suggests, when he says—"The fish seems a fit emblem of Him whose spiritual children are, like the offspring of fishes, born in the water of baptism."

Occasionally, too, we meet with rude representations of such parts of Scripture history as were suited to the condition of the Church. The most popular of these was Jonah, viewed as a type of our SAVIOUR'S death and resurrection. Eagerly, indeed, was it seized on by those who, meeting for worship, where the dead surrounded them, were ready to aid their trembling faith by any symbol which could suggest a life to come. Another favorite representation was that of Noah receiving the dove and olive branch. Perhaps to this their attention was directed by its application to the baptismal rite made by St. Peter. Sometimes, too, we find them shadowing forth their own preservation in those fearful times by representing the perils of Daniel, and the three youths in the fiery furnace. In all cases, indeed, the situation of the Church was conspicuously displayed in their choice of subjects. We see that these representations are not executed by those revelling in luxurious ease. They tell of times of peril and conflict.

It is interesting, too, in these inscriptions, to trace the different offices of the Church, as they existed at that early day among the Roman Christians. Here, for instance, in the Lapidarian Gallery, is the inscription which once covered the remains of a Bishop, for the title *Papa* applied to him is one which in that age denoted Episcopal rank. Thus Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, is always styled in the letters addressed to him by the Roman Clergy, "the blessed Pope Cyprian." The individual, thus buried in the Catacombs, died at the age of seventy, and those who raised his monument addressed him in these words—to give part of the epitaph—

PERPETVAM SEDEM NVTRITOR POSSIDES
DEFVNCTE

"You, our nursing-father, occupy a perpetual seat, being dead," &c.

Here is the inscription over one in the second order of the ministry. His tomb bears the epitaph—*LOCVS BASILI PRESB.* "The resting place of Basilus, the Presbyter." Here is another, which marks the sepulcher of a Deacon—*LOCVS EXVPERANTI DIACON*—"The resting place of Exuperantius, the Deacon." Besides these, we find the lower ranks of Readers, Exorcists, and Fossors. The latter was

an order which was retained among the lower clerical grades until a late period. Their business was to take care of the remains of the dead, and bury them with suitable solemnities—an office, the proper discharge of which, in days of persecution and martyrdom, was accompanied with no little danger.

Such are the principal points connected with the Catacombs. We have endeavored to bring them forward as fully as the space allotted to a single article would allow, because we believe it is a subject interesting to the members of the Church to learn something of this, its early cradle. We feel, however, that we have executed most imperfectly the task we marked out. No one can fully realize the spirit which animated these primitive Christians, unless he has been through "the dens and caves of the earth" where once they celebrated the solemn mysteries of their faith, or mused for hours in the Lapidarian Gallery over the inscriptions wrought by those who for seventeen centuries have been dust.

The contrast, indeed, is a strange one as we emerge from these gloomy retreats to the light and glory of an Italian day. The landscape, it is true, is unaltered. The Campagna is there, spread out as of old—the Claudian Aqueduct goes sweeping over it, with its countless arches, as it did in the days of the Cæsars—and yonder are the purple Alban Hills, glowing with the beauty which has marked them for two thousand years. Yet on the distant heights, the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter is in ruins, and no smoke of sacrifice ascends from its altars. Between us and the city, the Flavian Amphitheater still rears its massive walls; yet no blood of the martyrs enriches its sands. The once despised Cross stands in the middle of its arena, where Ignatius died; and now, at times, you may hear on that spot the voice of some humble Monk, as he preaches the faith of the Crucified, and his earnest appeals echo through those galleries which once rang with the shouts of thousands who had assembled to see a Christian die. The Imperial City is there in all her solemn and venerable magnificence, yet we see rising, in the deep blue of an Italian sky, a perfect wilderness of towers and pinnacles, each gleaming with its Cross—each devoted to the worship of Him, whom once it was death here to name with aught of reverence. And towering above all, swells forth that miracle of art, St. Peter's Dome, surmounting the noblest structure the world has ever seen, yet now the shrine of a faith before whose resistless march the ancient Paganism of Rome was trampled into the dust.

Would that the contrast could end here—that we could speak only of the triumphs of this cause! Yet we fear a change has passed, also, over the spirit of the Church, and the faith now taught in the multitude of temples which adorn the streets of modern Rome, differs widely from that which the early disciples learned amidst the recesses of the Catacombs. Perilous as were those times, we yet see nothing gloomy in the symbols or the inscriptions with which they laid their brethren to rest. They had too little for which to live, even to harbor a thought of hostility against those whose persecution separated them from this decaying life; and their visions of glory were too vivid to suffer them to lament the athlete of CHRIST, when he had worthily finished his course. The dismal pictures of martyrdom which now meet our gaze at every step, are the productions of later days. They are the signs of a period when the spirit of the Church had become dark and gloomy. Fond as the early Christians were of delineating the different scenes of our LORD's history, in all their pictures and sculptures, no attempt has been made to show his sufferings or death. They seem to have shrank from this with reverential awe. They often pictured Him as the Good Shepherd, bearing a lamb upon His shoulders, but never as expiring on the Cross. They felt that this was a theme for holy meditation, but not to be shadowed forth according to the artists earthly and degrading conceptions. Even when representing the three Hebrew youths in the mighty furnace on the plains of Dura, we notice that the fourth figure "like unto the Son of God," is always omitted.

A better illustration of the gradual change which passed over the spirit of the Church can not be found, than that exhibited by the alteration which from age to age took place, as the sign of the Cross, in its simplest form of two straight lines, grew into a wretched representation of the Passion, in a crucifix the size of life, smeared with the imitation of blood, and surmounted by a crown of actual thorns. In the Catacombs, the simple Cross alone is found, or if any addition is made, it is represented as crowned with flowers. For in that age it was a token of joy—a sign of gladness—a pledge of the Christian's victory. It took centuries for it to become what the Church of Rome afterwards represented it—a thing of tears and agony—a subject to enable the artist to display the height of intense anguish.

And yet, as we said, we can easily trace on the monuments of antiquity, the steps by which the Cross grew into the cru-

cifix and the bleeding agony of our LORD. The first addition was a lamb placed at its foot. The next stage was our LORD, clothed, extended on the cross, but not nailed to it, his hands uplifted in prayer. Then came the delineation of the Sufferer fastened to the cross with four nails, yet still living, and with open eyes. It was not till the tenth or eleventh century that he was represented as dead.* But did not each step display a proportionate change in the spirit of reverence which had marked the early Church? Was not that a loftier feeling which was content to worship Him in his Divinity, while it shrank from coarsely delineating the corporeal pangs which weighed down His humanity? We feel, indeed, when we come down to the tenth and eleventh centuries, and see the Byzantine paintings in the cabinet of the Vatican Library, representing our Lord as the "man of sorrows," covered with triangular splashes of blood, with a face indicative of hopeless anguish, that we have turned to a dark page in the history of Christendom. We have lost all that was ideal and divine. "The sky of sacred art darkened, as the Saviour's countenance, its proper sun, shed a more disastrous light over its scenes of woe; till the last glimmering of Divine Majesty suffered total eclipse from the exclusive display of agonized humanity."†

So it was, too, with regard to the First Person of the Trinity. The early Christians never represented the Father in a human form. No where do we trace any of that gross profanity—that absence of all reverential spirit, which now is seen in every gallery in Italy, when the Father of the universe is delineated as an old man with flowing white hair and beard. There are among the sculptures of the Catacombs only two instances where even a symbol is used to portray His presence. These are in representations of Abraham offering up Isaac, and Moses receiving the law. In the first of these, a hand stretching out from heaven, denotes the interposition of the Deity, while in the second, the hand is encircled by clouds, as if to show more strongly its symbolic character. These are found on sarcophagi, now in the library of the Vatican. According to Milman, the earliest representation of the Father in human form, is found in an illuminated Bible, of the ninth century.

There are other points also, now much insisted on by the

* This is the statement of Cardinal Bona, which has been adopted by Milman and other modern historians.

† Maitland, p. 166.

Church of Rome, with regard to which the silence of these inscriptions of the Catacombs is most unfortunate for their cause. No proof can be derived from these retreats in favor of the worship of the Virgin Mary. No prayer is offered to her in the epitaphs of the early Christians. *No ora pro nobis* is addressed to one, whom they regard only as "blessed among women." It took the lapse of centuries and the coming of darker days for the proper reverence of the Church for the mother of our Lord to deepen into actual adoration. It is doubtful, indeed, whether any delineations of the Virgin were executed before the fourth century, while it took two centuries longer to render them common. And even in these she was almost always veiled, and the highest attempt of the artist was to throw around a figure thus covered, as much grace and modesty as his skill would allow.

We might also show the argument which can be derived from this source against the forced celibacy of the Clergy. The monument of Basilus, the Presbyter, which we have already mentioned, includes also on its inscription the name of "Felicitas, his wife." So, too, another records the virtues of LEVITAE CONIVNX PETRONIA,—"*Petronia, a Priest's wife.*" What must have been the custom of the Church when these epitaphs were publicly set up? We believe, indeed, that those Bishops, who, by their support of matrimony among the Clergy, drew down upon themselves the indignation of Jerome, were introducing no new doctrine, but rather striving, in an innovating age, to prolong the early simplicity of the Church. The very spirit, however, against which they warred, showed that clouds were darkening the horizon about them.

But we must close this article. We have reason to be thankful that Rome thus bears within her own bosom, the proofs of that early purity from which she herself has wandered—that the spirit of the first ages is so indelibly stamped on the walls of the Catacombs, that no sophistry can explain away its force. There the elements of a pure faith are written "with an iron pen, in the rock, forever," and the Church has only to look to "the hole of the pit whence she was digged," to see what she should again become. Would that she could learn the lesson! We are not of those who join in unmeasured vituperation of Rome. We know how much there is to reverence in the zeal with which she clings to the essentials of faith, and in her wide spread policy, which embraces the whole earth in its grasp. We look back with thankfulness to that hour, when the eye of Gregory first

rested on the captive Angles, in a Roman slave market, and he planned that enterprise which was to infuse new life into the expiring Church of Britain. But we know, too, the many errors with which Rome deforms the faith, and it is with a feeling of relief, that we turn from the gorgeous services of St. Peter's, to the traces of a simpler faith in THE CHURCH IN THE CATACOMBS.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

ANTICHRIST: or the Spirit of Sect and Schism. By JOHN W. NEVIN, President of Marshall College. 12mo. pp. 90. New York: John S. Taylor, 1848.

This is a remarkable work, from the pen of a remarkable man. The author, the Rev. Dr. Nevin, is a Clergyman of the German Reformed Communion in this country, who enters fully into the new Lutheran, or "Evangelical" movement in Europe, and who, in some respects, has even gone beyond the most orthodox teachers of the "German Church." On the doctrine of the Sacraments, many of the "Evangelical theologians" of Germany, hold doctrines and sentiments, against which the most thorough Churchman could hardly take exception. At the same time, many of these hold most unchurchly sentiments in regard to *the Church*. In this respect, the Rev. Dr. Nevin, and those associated with him, are more thoroughly orthodox than their brethren in Germany. They seem to have attained a deeper and stronger sense of the truth embodied in the old doctrine of ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,—as the Body of CHRIST,—and the medium of communicating His Life to the world,—and hence can not but look upon the present divisions and sub-divisions of Christendom, as a grievous evil, productive of the most bitter consequences,—to be endured while it must,—to be justified never—to be escaped from so soon as possible. The *spirit*, therefore, which originates,—but especially, which *perpetuates* these divisions, is the *spirit of Anti-Christ*,—substituting the Sect for the Church, and private whim and fancy, for the general sense of Catholic Christianity.

Most of the ideas developed in the book, are familiar to well-educated Churchmen, yet they are presented in the work before us, with a freshness and vigor, and with a copiousness and pertinency of illustration, which throws around them new and lively interest. Our author finds the characteristic mark of Anti-Christ, in the description of St. John,—the denial of the fact, that CHRIST *is come in the flesh*,—shows briefly how this was done at first, by Judaism on one side, and Paganism on the other,—subsequently by the *Ebionitic*, or Humanitarian heresy on the one hand, and the Gnostic, or spiritually mystic on the other,—essentially reproduced in the Pelagian and Manichean heresies,—and still again substantially by the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies,—re-appearing in these modern days, under the character of *Rationalism* and *Sectarianism*. These two forms of error, approaching the truth from different sides, and yet continually falling over into each other, our author regards as the spirit of Anti-Christ; and he has drawn, with clear vision and masterly hand, twelve distinct and prominent marks of Anti-Christ, now plainly seen in the sect-system of the present time.

The Germanic style of the work, though perhaps unavoidable, considering the origin and object of the book, will be a serious draw back upon the interest of common readers, while the author's stand-point does not enable him to see the sufficiency of the remedy already at hand, for the evil he deplors with such truth and eloquence. The "Church of the Future," to which he is looking with such longing, ardent gaze, must be the ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC, AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH, as it existed in the earliest ages, and with various modifications, has existed, and still exists to enlighten and save the world. With these exceptions, the work in question is well calculated to meet the want it has so truthfully portrayed. We commend it to the careful attention of all, in the Church and out of it.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH, during the Three First Centuries. By Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German, by Henry John Rose, B. D., etc. 8vo. pp. 486. Stanford & Swords: New York, 1848.

We can give only a passing notice of this volume at present, since we design as early as possible to give the historical works of Neander a thorough review. That Neander has great learning, none will doubt. That he is strongly latitudinarian, and unchurchly almost to the extreme of Quakerism, are facts that can not be questioned. That he is read, and will be read,—that he is exerting, and will continue to exert no small degree of influence, can not be doubted. It is important, therefore, that his readers should know where, and how far he can be trusted, and when and where his imperfect and unsound views will be likely to lead astray. Such a guide we design to furnish at our earliest opportunity. We can only say now, therefore, that of all his works, the one before us is the most reliable, while the *notes* of the translator furnish a safeguard against some of the more important errors of the work.

THE SAINT'S TRAGEDY, or the true story of Elizabeth of Hungary, Landgravine of Thuringia, Saint of the Romish Calendar. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, Junior, Rector of Eversley. With a Preface by Professor Maurice. London: John W. Parker, 1848. 12mo. pp. 271.

If not a drama in the highest sense of the word, we have here a true poem, which seems to fulfill all the author's attempt. It is not a play, but it is a fine succession of deeply interesting scenes, and would furnish a gorgeous series of pictures to the dramatic crayons of Moritz Retzsch.

We wish Mr. Kingsley had more clearly shown us his theological bearings in his preface, for we hardly know what to make of his equivocal use of the terms *Catholic* and *Protestant*, or what he means to include in the expression, "Luther and his associate reformers." Does he mean the reformers of the Church of England? Mr. Maurice is proverbially "a blind guide," and we can not explain what he means by praising such a writer as Michelet. We wish such a poem as this had been put rather under the patronage of Maitland, the admirable critic of "the Dark Ages."

We have no fault to find with the *plot*, for this drama is a *history*, and we have no right to expect any other plot, than the facts which are very ingeniously fitted with circumstances, or illustrative accidents. The versification is very often faultless, but is perhaps too often broken by Shakspearian prose, and hemistichs; and by most *un-Shakspearian* asterisks. We wish these blemishes were removed, and several instances of metrical impropriety amended. There is a too frequent recurrence of the *double-close*, in which blank verse so much rejoices if it be sparingly introduced. In one instance a false emphasis is required by it:

"Or towns retaken from the Tartar *can* give."

Why not strike out the *can*, and leave it a good verse? We must also be pardoned for rapping Mr. Kingsley's knuckles for an occasional *Americanism*. There ought to be no such word as *lengthy*, and no such verb as *test*; yet we find both in this book. *Greenhorn* will do for "Sam Slick;" but from the mouth of a Court-fool of the 13th century, we are surprised to hear it, in a work so rich in its antiquarian material, as "the Saint's Tragedy." An American author would suffer severely, for such slips, from British Critics.

In the great purpose and drift of the poem, we deeply sympathize with its

author. It sets forth (with honesty and fidelity, but with true charity) the lights and shadows of Mediæval piety; and after reading it, we feel that we better appreciate, than before, the secret springs of that kind of fanaticism which characterized St. Dunstan; and the real sensualism which lurks at the root of Romish views of virginity and marriage. Its moral is allowed to point itself, and we feel it keenly, conceiving more clearly than ever the holiness of that "great mystery" of matrimony, which the word of God commends as "honorable in all," but which the theology of Rome so shamefully degrades into licensed concubinage.

There is a very small sect of Mediæval sentimentalists in the Church who talk much, and know nothing, of the times which this poem portrays; and if we really supposed them capable of studying any thing, or of any true appreciation of art, we should beg to call their attention to this beautiful poem. To others we commend it on general principles; but to them on principles of medicine. There is *wine* in it which they will relish; and *bark*, which will distort their faces as they swallow, but which will break their fever, and prove a healthful tonic.

THE WORKS OF WASHINGTON IRVING. New edition, revised. Vol. I. Knickerbocker's New York. New York: George P. Putnam. 1848. 12mo. pp. 452. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

It was with no ordinary feelings of pleasure, that we recently saw announced, as about to appear, a new and complete edition of the works of Washington Irving, revised and enlarged by the author; and to be published by a house which will faithfully and satisfactorily perform what it undertakes. Notwithstanding the narrow-minded, unscholarlike spirit which has characterized certain of the English Reviewers, especially the Westminster, in speaking of Mr. Irving's works, they are beyond question justly and universally regarded as occupying the very highest place in the department of elegant literature. In the purity of his language; the gracefulness of his style; in his fascinating union of the gay, the pensive and the whimsical; and especially in the high moral tone of sentiment which pervades his pages, he stands unsurpassed in the range of English Classics. With as much genuine humor as Swift or Sterne, he is entirely free from their grossness; and with all the unaffected ease and naturalness of Addison and Steele, he excels them both in vivacity. Of him it may be most truly said, "*Nullum quod tetigit non ornavit.*" The first volume in the series, is "A History of New York, from the beginning of the world to the end of the Dutch dynasty, by Diedrick Knickerbocker." In the "author's apology," which prefaces the book, we have the circumstances under which the work was at first written, and which must certainly disarm criticism at the author's acknowledged liberties with the early provincial history of New York, and at his mirth-provoking picture of its manners, customs, &c. The style in which the publisher is furnishing these volumes to the public, is every thing that could be desired. At the risk of ringing again a coin which has passed undisputed for almost half a century, and whose image and superscription of wit and genius, are bright as when it came fresh from the mint, we promise ourselves the pleasure of returning again to this inviting series.

LITERARY SKETCHES AND LETTERS: being the final Memoirs of CHARLES LAMB, never before published. By THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, one of his Executors. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton, 1848. 12mo. pp. 206. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The delay of the publication of these "Sketches and Letters," so long after the death of Charles Lamb—about twelve years—is owing to a melancholy

event in the history of his family, which for wise reasons had been concealed from the world, until the recent death of his sister, Mary Lamb, who was most immediately concerned. Under the hallucinations of an uncontrollable lunacy, she had committed a matricidal act, which at one moment made her an orphan, and a marked object of horror and neglect. That event she survived more than fifty years, and her brother almost forty years, and the circumstances necessarily growing out of it deeply tinged the current of both their subsequent lives. Her death, which occurred in May of the last year, has removed the veil of secrecy which the sacredness of friendship had thrown around an important portion of the life of Charles Lamb, and it has been the duty of his Executor, Thomas Noon Talfourd, to give to the world these Literary Sketches and Letters. It is not now our purpose to delineate the life and character of the subject of this volume. To some extent this has already been done by English and American Reviewers; but we think, that hitherto justice has hardly been awarded to all the elements which were blended in this remarkable and eccentric man. The sweetness and gentleness of character, for which his previous productions have gained him a reputation, were not less truly his, than a degree of moral heroism, and masculine energy of mind, which the present volume exhibits.

The Editor has given us a great number of letters, never before published, in his intercourse with such men as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Gifford, Hazlitt, and Manning, some of which are exceedingly diverting, connected as they are with prominent incidents in the lives of these distinguished literary characters. If our limits permitted, we would particularize here; but we can not avoid alluding to an amusing letter of Lamb to Wordsworth, on the liberty taken by Gifford with Lamb's Review of Wordsworth's *Excursion*, prepared for the *London Quarterly*. Talfourd also sketches with great beauty, some of the companions of Lamb, at his suppers at the Temple. We think this one of the best chapters in the book, as it is the last.

The religious element in Lamb's character leaves us most to regret, and awakens the saddest reflections. He was not, his Editor says, skeptical, and he certainly was not destitute of religious sensibilities; moreover, the fortitude with which he bore affliction, was remarkable; but yet we find every where lacking the absorbing reality and power of a living Faith, which is so eminently needed and completely adapted to tranquilize such a nervous, excitable being, as the subject of this volume.

We only add, that the interest of this work is indebted almost as much to the gifted pen of the Editor, as to the materials which he has arranged and embodied.

THE WORK CLAIMING TO BE THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE HOLY APOSTLES, including the CANONS; Whiston's version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their Origin and Contents; Translated from the German, by IRAH CHASE, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton. 1848. 8vo. pp. 496.

Whatever may have been the origin of these Constitutions and Canons, they are certainly among the most interesting, and in some respects, important relics of antiquity. They throw much light upon the doctrines and usages of the early Church. A thorough review of this volume has been received, but not in season for the present number. The publishers in venturing upon such costly works, and furnishing them in such elegant style, and apparently without regard to expense, are perpetuating an already well earned reputation.

THE OLD MAN'S HOME. By Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M. A., author of "The Shadow of the Cross," &c. With engravings from Original Designs by WEIR. New York: Gen. Prot. E. S. S. Union, Daniel Dana, Jr., Agent. Depository, 20 John street. 1848. 12mo. pp. 108.

This is a Narrative of an "Old Man" of ninety-six years, whom the writer first meets in a romantic dell on the coast of the Isle of Wight; and in whose mind the one all-engrossing thought which took complete possession of every feeling and sympathy of his nature was that of his final HOME. His residence in the asylum for half a century, his literal interpretation of the precepts and promises of God's Holy Word—his reputed insanity—his allegorical conversation—his attachment to "little Annie"—his past history and bereavements—his death, and his resting place in the churchyard, are incidents which the gifted writer has woven into a story, told with great simplicity and effect. The illustrations of the engraver are as tastefully executed as the designs (which are original with the "Union") are happily conceived. We are not surprised at the popularity of Mr. Adams' books.

THE FALL OF CRESUS. By Rev. W. ADAMS, M. A., author of "Shadows of the Cross," &c. Published as above. 12mo. pp. 208.

The Sunday School Union have furnished, in this volume, an entertaining and instructive book. The "Fall of Cresus" is an interesting chapter of ancient history, and a startling illustration of the truth of the overruling Providence of God. The story loses none of its charm as told by Mr. Adams's pen. We think, however, that in his discussion of the question of the inspiration of the Heathen Oracles, he has conceded more than has been usually allowed, either by ancients or moderns. Eusebius seems to regard those Oracles as a mere exhibition of human fraud. The wiser of the heathens so regarded them. Theodoret, by facts which he states, lets us into the secret of the juggling knavery which was commonly practiced. And yet, Eusebius, as most of the ancient Christian writers, supposes that with this human fraud habitually carried on, there might have been sometimes a mixture of *demoniacal* tricks. Perhaps Mr. Adams does not mean to concede more than this.

THE KING'S MESSENGERS: an Allegorical Tale. By Rev. Mr. ADAMS. Published as above by the S. S. Union, 1848. 12mo. pp. 142.

The design of this Allegory is to illustrate the Christian sentiment of "Stewardship." In the city of Metæcia, lying west of the dominions of the Great King, were four brothers, Philargyr, Megacles, Euprepes, and Sophron; impersonations of Avarice, Fame, Ostentation, and Heavenly Wisdom. The Allegorical representations by which these moral qualities pass before us, are ingeniously sustained, and the final end of each impressively described. The "King's Messengers" are the calls of charity. We think this the most ingenious of Mr. Adams's Allegories. The engravings are from original designs, and the whole execution of the work is far in advance of the London edition.

THE DISTANT HILLS.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS.

These are two Allegories from the pen of Rev. Mr. Adams, and also are published by the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union. They are, perhaps, the best written and the most popular of Mr. Adams' works. The last of which (named above) has already passed through several American

editions. The illustrations are wholly original with the Union, and are apt and beautiful.

The former of these Allegories, illustrates the duty of having constantly in view the "Heavenly Rest," and is written with decided point and effect.

The latter of these volumes is more varied in its design. It portrays the diversity of human dispositions and tastes as the source of constant temptations, and the Grace of God in CHRIST as man's only hope and strength. In one respect, this latter work is liable to misconstruction and objection. In presenting prominently the Grace of God given in Baptism, the author fails to notice another truth taught by the Church, "the infection of nature which doth remain in them that are regenerated," and the strong language of the allegory on this point might justify suspicion. In the former of the allegories, however, this doctrine of the Church is clearly presented, and the author leaves us no reason to doubt the soundness of his teachings. In respect to this important doctrine of the "infection of nature," the *Roman Church*, both in the language of the Council of Trent, and in her modern teaching at the present day, is not less distinct than our own Articles; only the *Romish Church* declares that that "infection" hath *not*, and our Articles declare that it *hath* the nature of sin. This doctrinal truth is one, which, as reminding us of our frailty, sinfulness and dependence, can never be safely obscured. That the Committee on Publications have endeavored to exercise due care in their recommendation of books, we have some reason to know. That they will guard vigilantly against every approach of error, we confidently trust.

SCRIPTURE VIEW of the Wine Question, in a letter to the Rev. Dr. NOTT, President of Union College. By M. STEWART, (late) Professor in the Theological Seminary at Andover. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co., 1848. 8 vo. pp. 64.

Mr. Stewart maintains that "when the Scriptures speak of wine as a comfort, a blessing, or a libation to God, and rank it with such articles as corn and oil, they mean—they can mean—only such wine as contained no alcohol, that could have a mischievous tendency; that whenever they denounce it, prohibit it, and connect it with drunkenness and revelling, they can mean only alcoholic or intoxicating wine."

We have but to remark, that the proof which Mr. Stewart offers, in defense of the above position, and which is scattered over about fifty pages of his work, is simply that of his own affirmation. Mr. Stewart also thoroughly abandons the ground once maintained, that it is duty to abstain from alcoholic drinks *under all circumstances*, and now maintains that "alcohol, in very moderate quantities, may be indulged in, rousing up and quickening the dilapidated or exhausted powers of the body."

ELEMENTS OF METEOROLOGY, with questions for examination, designed for the use of Schools and Academies. By JOHN BROCKLESBY, A. M., Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, in Trinity College, Hartford. Illustrated with engravings. New York: published by Pratt, Woodford & Co., 1848. 12 mo. pp. 240.

This is a fresh contribution to the cause of Natural Science in the United States. Under the term Meteorology, the author considers the various Phenomena of the Atmosphere. The book consists of Six Parts. The first is devoted to the Atmosphere; its pressure, density, weight, temperature, humidity, &c. The second is devoted to Aerial Phenomena; as winds, hurricanes, tornadoes, and water spouts. The third treats of Aqueous Phenomena; as rain, fogs, clouds, dew, hoar-frost, snow and hail. The fourth is upon Elec-

trical Phenomena. The fifth treats of Optical Phenomena; and the sixth of Luminous Phenomena; as meteorites, shooting stars, and the Aurora Borealis. The subjects of the volume are not only important, but attractive; and as this is the only text book of the kind in the English language, it must be extensively used. As to the manner of the book, we think the author has been entirely successful. Under each head, the prominent results of modern discovery are concisely stated; the style of the author is clear and vigorous; and the whole appearance of the book altogether inviting. We wish to see such subjects introduced into our higher schools, both because of their own intrinsic importance, and because they are so rich in illustration of the power, wisdom, and love of the CREATOR.

C. JULIUS CÆSAR'S COMMENTARIES on the Gallic War, with English notes, Critical and Explanatory, a Lexicon, Indexes, &c. By Rev. J. A. SPENCER, A. M., Editor of the New Testament in Greek, Arnold's Series of Greek and Latin Books, &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton & Co., 148 Chestnut street, 1848. 12mo. pp. 408. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

It is difficult to say in which respect Julius Cæsar most excelled; whether as the military commander, the historian, or the orator. He was one of those few great men, whom God raises up from time to time, to be the scourge of corrupt nations. These "Commentaries," which are Cæsar's own memoranda of his conquests in Gaul and Britain, have much of the "*veni, vidi, vici*," the sententious brevity in which he excelled. In the present edition, Mr. Spencer, who is a practical and successful teacher, has bestowed careful attention upon the *Text*, the punctuation and the Notes. The publishers have omitted nothing necessary to furnish a useful and serviceable book for high schools and academies, and as such, we confidently commend it to the attention of teachers and others.

HIGH SCHOOL PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY of the English language, abridged from the American Dictionary of Noah Webster, LL. D., with accented Vocabularies of Classical, Scripture, and Modern Geographical Names. By WM. G. WEBSTER. New York: Huntington & Savage, 1848. 16mo. pp. 360.

It is of vast importance that the people of the United States should all write and speak the English language alike. Unity of language will tend to beget unity and nationality of character. We know of no one series of works which is so likely and so worthy to become the standard of the country, as that of which Noah Webster is the author. The work before us is an abridgement of the large quarto, but yet contains about thirty thousand words, besides valuable tables of Scripture, Classical and Geographical Names. It is compiled by the son of the distinguished lexicographer, and may be relied upon as in strict correspondence with the larger works of his father.

INDEX TO SUBJECTS treated in the Reviews and other Periodicals, to which no Indexes have been published. Prepared for the Library of the "Brothers in Unity," Yale College. New York: Geo. P. Putnam, 1848. 8vo. pp. 154.

The general plan of this book is excellent; with the compilation, we are not so well pleased. It should have contained the Indexes already prepared, the omission of which is a serious defect, and which, we trust, will be supplied in a second edition. Besides, the references are by altogether too large a proportion confined to American Magazines. On a single page, for example,

containing forty-six references, eighteen of these are to a work but very little known, and of small authority with either scholars or theologians. To prepare a book of this kind, which shall be a real *vade mecum* for literary persons, is not the effort of a single month or year. Still, with all its defects, it is a valuable book, and is creditable to the young gentlemen by whom the plan was projected.

POPERY DELINEATED, in a brief Examination and Confutation of the Unscriptural and Anti-scriptural Doctrines and Practices maintained and inculcated by the Modern Church of Rome, in the unrescinded Decrees of her Councils and Canon Law, and in her authorized and acknowledged Formularies of Faith and Worship. Second edition, corrected and enlarged. London: William Edward Painter, 342 Strand. 1848. 18mo. pp. 216.

The author of this work is Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D., who has brought his well stored mind to bear upon the character and pretensions of the corrupt Modern Church of Rome. The Roman authorities which he freely cites, are the "Breviary and Missal, the creed of Pope Pius IV, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and other Formularies of Devotion and Instruction." The points which Dr. Horne examines are, I. The willful omission of the Second Commandment of the Decalogue in Popish Catechisms. II. Her prohibition of the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue by the Modern Church of Rome. III. The assertion of Papists that they do *not* adore or worship the Blessed Virgin Mary, or the Cross, &c. IV. Refutation of the False Interpretation put on the Ninth Article of the Apostles' Creed by the Modern Church of Rome. V. The Papal claim of Supremacy. VI. Peter *not* invested with the Superintendence of the Church. VII. The perpetuity of the Church of Rome disproved, in which the author shows that the Modern Church of Rome is *not* the Catholic Church, and though *truly* a Church, is not a *true* Church. VIII. Notices of unanswerable replies to certain Papist publications.

We hope to see this little work republished in this country. It will assist Churchmen in understanding what they mean when they say so often, in the Creeds, that they believe in "the Holy Catholic," and "in One Catholic and Apostolic Church." It will help to correct that false public sentiment, which still persists throughout almost the entire press of this country in calling the Roman Church "*the Catholic Church*," and Romanists, Catholics. The sooner we meet this question the better. It is the great ecclesiastical question of the age—*What, and where, is the Catholic Church of CHRIST?* What are the true, essential notes or marks of that Church?

We, solemnly and formally profess our belief in "One Catholic and Apostolic Church." The Romanists claim that they, and *they alone*, are that Church. We deny the claim. We say, that they have lost such of the *essential marks* of that Church as to peril man's salvation, and to render communion with her criminal; and we say, that the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," as she is formally and technically called, has *all the essential marks or notes* of the Catholic Church. In an age when events about us are stirring up men to earnest inquiry—an age when the heart of Christendom is unmistakably yearning after something more substantial than the moving quicksands of changing Creeds, and modern developments, we are glad to see that such works as this of Mr. Horne are called for and are read. The question involved is not one of casuistry or momentary curiosity, but of deep and awful import. We repeat, it is the absorbing ecclesiastical question of the age.

THE CHURCH'S ARGUMENT FOR CHRISTIANITY, or the Apostolical Succession maintained and exhibited as evidence for the Truth of the Christian Religion. By the Rev. WILLIAM JOHNSON, author of a "Treatise on Infant Baptism." New York: J. A. Sparks. 1845. 16mo. pp. 176.

The course of argument, maintained in this work by Mr. Johnson, has been too much overlooked. Among the Evidences of Christianity, the *unbroken* preservation of the Christian Ministry is one of the very strongest. This was the argument which Leslie adopted in his "Short and Easy Method" with Deists; and which, we regret to say, the "American Tract Society," in republishing his work, omitted; an act of great injustice to its author, as it was a weakening of the force of his argument. The Infidels, as Mr. Johnson shows, have openly avowed this as one of their plans of attack upon Christianity; not by making bold assaults upon the system, but by covertly uniting with those who assail the Apostolical Succession for the purpose of breaking down these historical monuments of the Faith of CHRIST. This argument grows important with the lapse of time. It is now one of our strongest evidences of the Divine Institution of Judaism. Nor do we hesitate to say, that should Unitarian and Romish developments prevail, the result must necessarily be, all which is essential in Christianity will be obliterated. Hence we see that the "Church is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth."

Mr. Johnson grasps his subject strongly, and expresses himself in a clear and vigorous style.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION, *also the Doctrines and Institutions of Christianity*. With questions for use in Bible Classes, in Parochial, Family, Sunday, and other Schools. New York: Gen. Prot. Ep. S. S. Union. 1848. 18mo. pp. 224.

Hitherto we have known of no book really appropriate as a text book for our Bible Classes, and the larger Classes in our Sunday and Parochial Schools. To render instruction in these institutions effective, and such, also, as the Church needs, to prepare her sons and daughters to meet the latitudinarianism of the day, which often appears particularly fascinating to the young, there must be something as a guide, sufficiently full for ordinary learners, and furnishing topics for thorough examination to the more advanced. The present volume has been subjected to a most rigid scrutiny by the Committee on Publication, and we think contains nothing to which any true hearted Churchman can object.

MAN AND THE STATE, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL. An Address delivered before the Conn. Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Yale College, New Haven, Aug. 19, 1846. By D. D. BARNARD, LL. D.

SUBMISSION TO GOVERNMENT, the Christian's Duty. A Sermon for the third Sunday after Easter. By the Rev. HORATIO POTTER, D. D., Rector of St. Peter's, Albany. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1848.

A DISCOURSE, delivered in the First Church, Boston, before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, June 5, 1848, being the CCXth Anniversary. By THOMAS P. TYLER, Rector of Trinity Church, Fredonia, Western New York.

The Problem of Government is becoming one of the great problems of the age. The *origin* of Government; the *form* of Government; the *authority* of Government, are points on which the thoughtful men of the world are

beginning to ponder deeply. Every portion of Europe is more or less convulsed with the agitation of these questions. In one nation, errors pertaining to the origin, prerogatives and powers of Government, have pervaded such large masses of the people, as to have led already to scenes of carnage and brutality, at which the darkest ages of the world might have blushed. The same elements of disorder and misrule are at work in the United States. The same seeds of mischief are scattered on the wings of the wind. Infidel dogmas, of the most radical and revolutionary character, respecting land ownership; respecting social and domestic organizations; respecting the "Rights of Labor," are promulgated from day to day in journals which are supported by the most respectable of our citizens, by even Ministers and professing Christians, of various denominations, who, though startled now and then by some new and bold development, seem not to consider whereunto these things surely tend, nor from what spirit they proceed. Let such principles prevail as are now patronised among us, and titles to our houses and lands are not worth a single torch-light, and the scenes of the "four days of Paris" will be re-acted on our own shores. A deep-seated cunning Infidelity is at the bottom of all this movement. Opposition of the depraved natural heart to God's Government, in the Family, the Church, and the State, is the moving cause. It is a new method of an old and arch adversary, who knows well enough what he is about. We mean just what we say. And this will explain our expression of gratitude at receiving, from different parts of the country, several Sermons and Orations, delivered at different times, on different occasions, by different individuals, before different classes of persons, yet all boldly proclaiming the same duty, namely, of "Submission to Government," and that on the ground that Civil Government is an ordinance of God.

The publications above enumerated are very diverse in their method, but very harmonious in their spirit. The first is philosophical, the second is practical, and the third is particular. We can not now say more, without extending our notice too much; but the readers of the Review may expect to find in its pages hereafter, Truths on this subject spoken without disguise, and in a manner to be understood.

We have received the recent numbers of the "*True Catholic*," an able and vigorous Monthly Magazine, published at Baltimore, edited by a Layman, with the approbation of the Bishop of Maryland.

The *True Catholic*, as it appears, has adopted a rule never "to review an official act of a Bishop." There is, beyond doubt, a principle of sound Churchmanship to which this rule has reference, the violation of which principle has been a fruitful and mortifying source of evil in the Church. There are, however, limitations to its pertinence, of commanding importance; which still leave to us the duty of commending the well-timed instructions of our Rt. Rev. Fathers on the one hand, and also, on the other, of comparing every sentiment with the acknowledged teachings of the Catholic Church. The principle for which the *True Catholic* contends, pertains not only to the official acts of Bishops, but necessarily also to the official acts of the humblest Presbyter and Deacon of the Church. Suppose it to be so, then—and the learned Editor will admit that the case is supposable—that error shall chance to stalk into high places, and speak with oracular authority; shall we bind ourselves by a vow of silence, when a higher duty demands that we speak plainly?

The comments of the *True Catholic* upon some historical statements in the last number of the Review, are quite at variance with the estimate of others, whose fidelity to the Church, and whose intelligence, especially on

such subjects, will not be questioned. We take pleasure in acknowledging the courtesy of the True Catholic's allusion to the Church Review, and to profess ourselves—we hope our pages will show it is no unmeaning profession—the humble, faithful servants of that Church which is “Truly Catholic” in her doctrine and discipline—“Reformed” from all essential errors—“Protestant” against all corruptions of Primitive Faith and Practice—and “Free” from all the shackles which can afflict her from without;—a Church which, we believe, is to fulfill a high and holy mission in the field which she occupies; a mission—of faith amid sense—of constancy amid defection—and of ultimate triumph amid the final overthrow of error in all its various forms.

BISHOP HENSHAW'S CHARGE to the Clergy of his Diocese, at the Annual Convention, June 13, 1848.

The subject presented in this Charge is the “Stewardship of the Christian Ministry”—showing that the Ministers of CHRIST are Stewards of the Mysteries of God; and that these “Mysteries” pertain to *Doctrines, Sacraments, and Discipline*. In this Charge of Bishop Henshaw, there is a felicity of statement, a moderation of tone, and a faithfulness of practical appeal, which give to it peculiar value.

We acknowledge the reception of several Journals of Diocesan Conventions, as follows:

Of the Sixty-fourth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Connecticut.

Of the Sixty-fourth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

Of the Sixtieth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Maryland.

Of the Fifty-eighth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Rhode Island.

Of the Fifty-eighth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Delaware.

Of the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Michigan.

Of the Twelfth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Illinois.

Of the Ninth Annual Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Missouri.

Of the Convention of the Church in the Diocese of Virginia.

A Summary of important Diocesan intelligence will be found under its appropriate head.

REPORT OF THE INCORPORATED SOCIETY for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for the year 1847; with the Sermon preached at the 146th Anniversary Meeting, &c. London: 1847. 8vo. pp. 236.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY for Africa and the East. Forty-seventh year; 1846—1847. London: 1847. pp. 336.

THE FORTY-THIRD REPORT of the British and Foreign Bible Society—1847; with an Appendix, &c. London: 1847. pp. 284.

For the above valuable publications, we are indebted to the kindness of

Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. In making up the Summary of English Missionary Intelligence for the present number, important aid has been derived from the above papers. Our files of English papers place us in possession of all the important intelligence from that vigorous branch of the Church Catholic.

We also acknowledge the reception of the following productions, in pamphlet form :

SCRIPTURE READING LESSONS for Little Children. First Series. From the London edition. By the Gen. Prot. Ep. S. S. Union.

CONFIRMATION AND COMMUNION. Also by the S. S. Union.

CATECHISM of the P. E. Church, simplified by Question and Answer. By a Member of the Diocese of South Carolina. Also published by the S. S. Union.

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society.

SALVATION BY GRACE THROUGH FAITH : a Sermon at the opening of Convention of the Diocese of Delaware. By Bishop Lee.

DR. A. H. VINTON'S SERMON before the Church Missionary Society for Seamen in the City and Port of New York.

AN APPEAL to the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, from the unjust and oppressive measures of the Secretaries and Prudential Committee. By Rev. J. D. Paxton, D. D.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.—DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Church.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Ambler, Charles E.,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Bentley, A.,	Potter,	June 29,	Epiphany,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Benedict, A. D.,	McIlvaine,	Aug. 20,	Trinity,	Columbus, Ohio.
Bishop, H. N.,	McIlvaine,	Aug. 20,	Trinity,	Columbus, Ohio.
Clarkson, R. G. H.,	Whittingham,	June 18,		St. James' Col. Chapel.
Downe, Thomas S.,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Eaton, T. Augustus,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Govenson, M. F.,	Kemper,	June 25,		Nashotah, Wisconsin.
Hall, George,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Hoffman, C. C.,	Potter,	June 29,	Epiphany,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Huntington, Gurdon,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Johnson, R. P.,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Jones, Alexander D.,	Whittingham,	June 11,		St. James' Col. Chapel.
Leach, W. A.,	Kemper,	June 25,		Nashotah, Wisconsin.
LeBaron, James F.,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Low, Prof. H. L.,	DeLancey,	June 18,	Trinity,	Geneva, W. N. Y.
Mackie, Andrew,	Doane,	July 2,	St. Mary's,	Burlington, N. J.
M'Cullough, J. D'W.,	Gadsden,	June 21,	Trinity,	Columbia, S. C.
Page, Rolla Oscar,	Eastburn,	July 30,	St. John's,	Jamaica Plains, Mass.
Passinde, J. C.,	Whittingham,	June 18,		St. James' Col. Chapel
Phelps, Josiah,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Pierre, H. N.,	Freeman,	April 2,	Christ,	Matagorda, Texas.
Pynchon, T. R.,	Brownell,	June 20,	St. Paul's,	New Haven, Conn.
Quick, Charles W.,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Rambo, Jacob,	Potter,	June 20,	Epiphany,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Reed, Sylvanus,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Reid, Horace Hall,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Rogers, Robert C.,	Brownell,	July 9,	St. John's,	Hartford, Conn.
Simmons, James W.,	Gadsden,	June 18,		South Carolina.
Slack, Samuel R.,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Smith, J. Howard,	Meade,	July 7,	Christ,	Alexandria, Vir.
Stearns, Rufus D.,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Tickner, James H.,	Cobbs,	May 26,	St. John's,	Montgomery, Ala.
Wiley, F. S.,	Potter,	June 29,	Epiphany,	Philadelphia, Pa.

PRIESTS.

Armstrong, W. C.,	Kemper,	June 14,	Trinity,	Jonesville, Wisconsin.
Barton, Lewis,	McIlvaine,	May 9,	Christ,	Hudson, Ohio.
Benedict, Thos. N.,	DeLancey,	June 18,	Trinity,	Geneva, W. N. Y.
Coe, James Wells,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Child, William S.,	Henshaw,	June 13,	Grace,	Providence, R. I.
Davis, W. L.,	Kemper,	June 14,	Trinity,	Jonesville, Wisconsin.
Duncan, Henry E.,	DeLancey,	July 2,	Grace,	New York City.
Downing, E. H.,	Otey,	May 14,	Christ,	Jefferson co., Miss.
Edwards, Henry,	Ives,	Aug. 13,	Trinity,	New Haven, Conn.
Flower, D. P.,	Cobbs,	July 12,	Nativity,	Huntsville, Ala.
Fontaine, Edward,	Otey,	May 14,	Christ,	Jefferson co., Miss.
Goodwin, D. R.,	Burgess,	Sept. 10,	St. Mark's,	Augusta, Maine.
Gregory, Almon,	DeLancey,	June 18,	Trinity,	Geneva, W. N. Y.
Hanckel, W. H.,	Gadsden,	July 18,		South Carolina.
Haskins, David G.,	Eastburn,	July 26,	St. James',	Roxbury, Mass.
Kelly, John,	Henshaw,	June 13,	Grace,	Providence, R. I.
Lay, Henry C.,	Cobbs,	July 12,	Nativity,	Huntsville, Ala.
Millett, D. C.,	DeLancey,	June 18,	Trinity,	Geneva, W. N. Y.
Prescott, Oliver S.,	Ives,	Aug. 13,	Trinity,	New Haven, Conn.
Stone, Joseph A.,	Eastburn,	July 26,	St. James',	Roxbury, Mass.

REMOVALS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>From Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>To Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Ashley, William B.,	St. James',	Birmingham, Conn.,	St. James',	Detroit, Mich.
Adderly, J.,		Pennsylvania,	St. Mark's,	Boardman, Ohio.
Baker, F. M.,		Alabama,	All Saints,	Frederick county, Md.
Chipchase, J.,	Christ,	Stepney, Md.,		St. Mary's Parish, Md.
Edwards, Henry,		East Haven, Conn.,		Stockport, New York.
Embury, Edward,				New Windsor, New York.
Evans, S. J.,		New York,	Trinity,	Bristol, Conn.
Fairchild, T. B.,		Logansport, Indiana,	Christ,	Hudson, Ohio.
Frishie, W. H.,	Christ,	Bethlem, Conn.,		Westport, Conn.
Gordon, G. S.,		Connecticut,	St. Peter's,	Peekskill, New York.
Kelly, John,		Delphi, Indiana,	St. Michael's,	Manchester, N. H.
Killikelly, B. B., D. D.,	St. Mary's,	Ohio,		Kittaning, Pa.
Killno, R. P.,			Ascension,	Baltimore, Maryland.
Loutrel, A. M.,			St. Paul's,	Columbus, Ohio.
Lewis, C. F.,			St. John's College,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Matson, W. A.,	Grace,	Waterville, New York,	St. John's,	Whitesboro', New York.
Moore, W. H.,	St. Michael's,	Manchester, N. H.,		Newport, Rhode Island.
Morison, J. H.,	St. John's,	Richmond Virginia,	St. John's,	Montgomery, Ala.
Payne, William,	Trinity College,	Hartford, Conn.,	St. George's,	Schenectady, New York.
Potter, Dexter,	Connecticut,		St. Thomas',	Vernon.
Preston, Thomas S.,	New York City,		Holy Innocents,	West Point, New York.
Reid, H. H.,	Annunciation,		St. Paul's,	Baltimore, Md.
Shannon, O. E.,			Crucifixion,	Moyamensing, Pa.
Sleight, [Slack,] G. N.,		Georgia,	St. Paul's,	Whitehall, New York.
Stevens, W. B., D. D.,		Newtown, Conn.,	St. Andrew's,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stocking, S. S.,		South Carolina,		New York.
Tillinghast, N. P.,	Trinity,	Stockport, New York,	St. John's,	Georgetown, D. C.
Townsend, Henry,			St. James',	Westville, Conn.
Watson, E. F.,			Christ,	Lonsdale, New York.
Wardwell, T. F.,				Syracuse, New York.

CONSECRATIONS.

Trinity,	Jonesville, Wisconsin,	Kemper,	June 14.
	Springfield, Illinois,	P. Chase,	July.
Trinity,	Lyme, Ohio,	M'Irvine,	July 28.
Ascension,	Gillisonville, South Carolina,	Gadsden,	June 11.
Christ,	New York City,	DeLancey,	June 29.
St. Saviour's,	Maspeth, Long Island,	LeLancey,	June 28.
Trinity,	Yazoo City, Mississippi,	Otey,	June 11.
Grace,	Elk Ridge Landing, Maryland,	Whittingham,	June 15.
St. Paul's,	Angelica, New York,	DeLancey,	July 23.
St. John's,	Wakeman, Ohio,	M'Irvine,	July 29.
Trinity,	Howard, New York,	DeLancey,	June 7.
St. George's,	St. Louis, Missouri,	Hawks,	April 13.
St. Luke's,	Milan, Ohio,	M'Irvine,	June 30.

DIOCESAN.

Connecticut. The Sixty-Fourth Annual Convention of this Diocese was held at New Haven, June 13th. The *Journal* furnishes the following statistics :

Families, in 73 Parishes, as by foregoing Reports, 6023. In the other 32 Parishes of the Diocese, according to Reports of previous years, 1003. Total, 7026.

Baptisms, of infants, during the last year in 82 Parishes, none reported in 23 others, 822. Of adults in 53 Parishes, none reported in 52 others, 212. Total, 1034.

Confirmations, during the last year in 54 Parishes, 541. Communicants, added by removal in 34 Parishes, 198. Added anew in 46 Parishes, 433. Lost by removal in 43 Parishes, 243. Lost by death in 51 Parishes, 146. Reported as added without distinction of manner in 16 Parishes, 191. Present number, in 78 Parishes, as by the year's Reports, 7548. In other 27 Parishes by reports of former years, 826. Present number, 8374.

Marriages during the last year in 72 Parishes, 441. Burials during the last year in 78 Parishes, 957. Sunday School teachers in 40 Parishes, 579. Scholars in 52 Parishes, 3951. Contributions reported from 60 Parishes, \$12,641 97. Deduct contributions devoted by 14 Parishes to their own objects, \$2301 41. Contributions for other than Parochial purposes, \$10,340 56.

From the Bishop's Address it further appears that there have been during the year, Ordinations, to the Diaconate, 5; to the Priesthood, 4. Total, 9. Institutions of Clergy into Parishes, 3. New Churches, consecrated, 1. Corner stones of New Churches laid and in process of erection, 7. Dimissory Letters, given to Clergymen, 9; received, 6. Candidates for Holy Orders, present number, 19.

Secretary of Convention, Rev. William Payne. *Treasurer*, T. Belknap, Esq.

Standing Committee. Rev. Drs. H. Croswell, S. F. Jarvis, W. C. Mead, and Rev. Messrs. R. A. Hallam and J. L. Clark.

Rhode Island. The Fifty-Eighth Annual Convention of this Diocese was held at Providence, June 13th. The *Journal* furnishes the following statistics :

Clergy, 28; Parishes, 28; Baptisms in 18 Parishes—infants, 134; adults, 62. Total, 201.

Communicants; added in 13 Parishes, 118; died or removed, 78; present number in 21 Parishes, 2240. Confirmed in 12 Parishes, 90. Marria-

ges, 88. Burials, 227. Sunday School teachers, 223; Scholars, 1681. Offerings in 10 Parishes, \$6,869 49

Secretary of Convention. Rev. Benj. Watson. *Treasurer,* E. W. Howard. *Standing Committee.* Rev. N. B. Crocker, D. D., Rev. George Taft, Rev. T. H. Vail, Rev. George W. Hathaway; Messrs. Thomas Burgess, R. Waterman, G. S. Wardell, and E. Wolcott.

Massachusetts. The Journal of the Fifty-Eighth Annual Convention furnishes the following statistics:

Clergy, 73. Baptisms, 752, of which 63 were adults; 541 added to the communion; the whole number of Communicants being 4,635. Confirmed, 233; number of Sunday School Scholars, 3,133; amount contributed for religious purposes, \$16,928 09.

Secretary of Convention, Rev. Joseph H. Clinch, South Boston. *Treasurer,* Rev. Asa Eaton, D. D., Boston.

Standing Committee. The Rev. A. H. Vinton, D. D., Rev. George M. Randall, Rev. John Woart; George M. Dexter, Edward S. Rand, Jr., Otis Daniell.

Delegates to General Convention. The Rev. A. H. Vinton, D. D., Rev. T. Edson, D. D., Rev. Charles Mason; William Appleton, Edward S. Rand, E. A. Newton, C. R. Codman.

Michigan. The Fourteenth Annual Convention of this Diocese was held at Kalamazoo, June 7th. The Journal gives us the following particulars:

Clergy, 27; Parishes, 28; Baptisms, infants 111, adults, 33; total 144. Confirmed, 80; Communicants in 17 Parishes, 706. Marriages, 51. Burials, 140.

Secretary of Convention, Rev. C. C. Taylor, Ann Arbor. *Treasurer,* Mason Palmer, Esq., Detroit.

Standing Committee. Rev. F. H. Cuming, Rev. William N. Lyster, Rev. C. C. Taylor, Rev. R. Bury; Messrs. C. C. Trowbridge, H. P. Baldwin, D. B. Miller.

Delegates to General Convention. Rev. Messrs. F. H. Cuming, C. C. Taylor, A. D. Cole, J. S. Large; and Messrs. H. P. Baldwin, C. C. Trowbridge, P. E. DeMill, C. W. Lane.

Kentucky. From the Journal of the Twelfth Annual Convocation we collect the following statistics: Clergy 22.

Secretary. Rev. Edward F. Berkley, Lexington. *Treasurer,* Lawrence P. Maury, Louisville.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. J. B. Gallagher, James Craik, Edward F. Berkley, Hon. William F. Bullock, and William F. Pettit.

Confirmations. The number of confirmations, at twenty-one different times, has been 118, of which, that at Frankfort was remarkable (12) as being the largest ever held there.

Georgia. Extract from the Journal of the last Convention. Clergy, 24. Parishes received into union with the Convention, 2.

Treasurer of Convention, William S. Williford, Macon.

Standing Committee. Rev. Drs. Edward Neufville, Edward E. Ford, and Rev. S. G. Bragg; Messrs. William B. Bulloch, William P. Hunter, and Robert M. Charlton.

Delegates to the General Convention. Rev. Drs. Edward Neufville, Edward E. Ford, Rev. Messrs. Seneca G. Bragg, and Thomas F. Scott; Thomas Potter, Esq., Hon. John M. Berrien, Nathan C. Munroe, Esq., and Major Thomas M. Nelson.

North Carolina. The Journal of the Twenty-second Annual Convention gives the following :

Clergy, 38. New Parishes admitted into union with the Convention, 4. Missionary Fund of the Diocese for the past year, \$2690 14. Balance on hand, \$1710 04. Baptisms, excess over the number reported last year, 268. Communicants, 64 more than reported last year. Confirmed, 128.

Standing Committee. Rev. R. S. Mason, D. D., Rev. Messrs. Albert Smedes, Jarvis B. Buxton ; Hon. John H. Bryan, and Mr. John S. Eaton.

Delegates to the General Convention. Rev. Drs. R. S. Mason, R. B. Drane, Rev. Messrs. Samuel I. Johnston, and F. M. Hubbard ; Messrs. Josiah Collins, John S. Eaton, John W. Wright, and Hon. John H. Bryan.

Treasurer of the Convention, John W. Wright, Fayetteville.

Secretary, Edward Lee Winslow, Fayetteville.

The religious house at Valle Crucis will henceforth devote its energies to the instruction of candidates, or those desiring to become candidates for Holy Orders. The importance of this institution to the Diocese is immense, as the nursery of a future ministry. It appears to possess peculiar advantages for this work, not only in the retirement, for the time being, of its students from the distractions of society, and the hardy and useful discipline to which they are inured, but also the great economy with which the work can be conducted, since \$50 apiece, per annum, may be made to cover all necessary expenses, except those for clothing.

It has been placed under the charge of a highly capable Presbyter, and is supported in part by the self-denying labors of a body of young men who have literally left all for CHRIST. Still it needs the fostering care of the members of the Church.

Delaware. The Fifty-eighth Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Delaware, met in Immanuel Church, New-castle, on Wednesday morning, May 31. The Journal gives the following particulars :

Clergy, 11. Parishes, 19. Baptisms, infants 91, adults 16—total, 107. Confirmed, 42. Communicants, lost 38, added 57, present number, 299. Marriages, 12. Burials, 54. S. S. Teachers, 74. Scholars, 609. Offerings, \$1559 26.

Secretary, Rev. Thomas F. Billopp. *Treasurer,* Edward Canby, Esq.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. Thomas F. Billopp, W. E. Franklin, E. M. Van Deusen ; William T. Read, and George B. Rodney.

Deputies to the General Convention. Rev. Messrs. Thomas E. Billopp, W. E. Franklin, A. F. Freeman, John L. McKim ; Messrs. William T. Read, Robert Burton, Edmund Canby, and Benjamin Gibbs.

Indiana. The Annual Convention of the Diocese assembled on Ascension Day, in St. John's Church, Lafayette, Indiana. The Convention was the largest ever held in Indiana ; there were present the Rt. Rev. Jackson Kemper, D. D., the acting Bishop, 14 Presbyters, and 19 Lay Delegates.

Standing Committee. Rev. Dr. J. W. McCullough, Rev. Messrs. Samuel Lee Johnson, Thomas B. Fairchild ; Messrs. Robert Jones, Sen., Andrew Ingram, and John Taylor.

Delegates to the General Convention. Rev. Drs. Andrew Wylie, J. W. McCullough, Rev. Messrs. Robert B. Croes, Solon W. Manney ; Messrs. P. P. Bailey, Joseph M. Moore, Henry C. Carter, and James Morrison.

Maryland. The Sixtieth Convention of the Diocese of Maryland met on Wednesday, the 31st May, in Baltimore. The Journal furnishes the following particulars :

Clergy, 120. Parishes and Congregations, 104. Baptisms, infants, 1223; adults, 86; not specified, 666—total, 1975. Confirmed, 196. Communicants, died, 112; removed, 252; added, 464; present number, 6206. Marriages, 418. Burials, 763. S. S. Teachers, 336; Scholars, 2322. Offerings, \$9,434.97.

Standing Committee. Rev. Dr. Wyatt, and the Rev. Messrs. Atkinson, Pinckney, and McKenney, for the Western Shore; and the Rev. Messrs. R. W. Goldsborough, Owen, and Crosdale, for the Eastern.

Missouri. The Ninth Annual Convention met at Booneville, May 10. The Journal gives the following particulars:

Clergy, 14. Baptisms, infants, 161; adults, 45—total, 206. Confirmed, 72. Communicants, lost, 41; added, 14; present number, 506. Marriages, 41. Burials, 70. S. S. Scholars, 125. Offerings, \$779.54.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. Whiting Griswold, William B. Corby, Charles Tomes, and Messrs. J. Parker Doan, and Daniel Hough.

Deputies to the General Convention. Rev. Messrs. A. D. Corby, William B. Corby, Charles Tomes, Whiting Griswold, and Messrs. Josiah Spalding, J. P. Doan, George W. Morton, and Robert N. Smith.

Illinois. The Twelfth Annual Convention of this Diocese met at Jacksonville, June 19th. The Journal gives the following particulars:

Clergy, 24. Parishes, 40. Baptisms, 239. Confirmations, 82. Communicants, 1007.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. S. Chase, C. Dresser, and Messrs. S. H. Treat, and A. Campbell.

Delegates to General Convention. Rev. Messrs. S. Chase, C. Dresser, C. V. Kelly, S. Y. McMasters, and Messrs. J. H. Kinzie, S. H. Treat, B. Gillette, and W. A. Grimshaw.

Pennsylvania. The Journal of the Sixty-fourth Annual Convention of this Diocese is full, and had the Secretaries given an abstract of its contents, would have been complete. We have made the following hasty synopsis of the Parochial Reports, which we presume is near the truth.

Baptisms, infants, 1605; adults, 178—total, 1783. Communicants, lost, 540; added, 852; present number, 8666. Marriages, 502. Burials, 947. S. S. Teachers, 1240; Scholars, 10,076. Offerings, etc. \$51,430.98.

Standing Committee. Rev. Dr. Hare, Rev. Mr. Howe, and Mr. Thomas Robins.

Note. ☐ The Standing Committee and Delegates to the General Convention, from *New Jersey*, were inadvertently inserted under the head of *Pennsylvania*, in the last number of the Review.

New Jersey. Extract from the Bishop's Address: "Brethren, this is my sixteenth convention. I have been your servant, now, almost as many years. At God's command, through you, unthought of and undreamed of by myself, I came to do your bidding. I left for you one of the oldest and most influential parishes of our communion, abundant duties, a competent provision, my bosom friends, my children's home. I came to an obscure and feeble Diocese: one-half of which, I was assured by one of your chief presbyters, was dead and could not be revived. But I have never for one moment doubted that I did right; or regretted what I did. I have found the best and truest friends. A happy home has grown up to my hand. I have been favored with as wide an influence, and with as large a confidence as human heart could wish. And, best of all, the work of God, through his unbounded and unmerited benevolence, has prospered in my hands. The eighteen clergymen of 1832, are sixty-one; the twenty-nine churches are now forty-nine.

Twenty-nine churches have been built, and one-third of that number have been well nigh rebuilt. Nine parsonage houses have been added. The revival and increase thus noted, I ascribe, under God, *to the influence, direct and indirect, of the undertaking for Christian Education, in which I have, for eleven years, been engaged.* And, under God, *I rely for the continuance of this revival, and the extension of this increase, on the two institutions now in successful operation at Burlington.*

Western New York. The Convention of this Diocese met at Geneva, August 16th. With the exception of the elections of standing committee and deputies to the General Convention, the affairs of Geneva College constituted the main business of the convention. The action of the convention, under God, has decided the hitherto apparently doubtful fortunes of the College. Various suggestions of the committee respecting the interest of the Diocese in this Institution were adopted by the convention in the form of resolutions, and a subscription towards filling up the endowment of the Hobart Professorship was made, which amounted to near \$1350. When a similar sum shall be obtained, the subscription of \$15,000 requisite to secure the grant of \$15,000 more from the Society for the Promotion of Religion and Reading, in New York, will be completed, and the College will at once receive an addition to its funds of \$30,000. We can not doubt the few hundred of dollars now required will be speedily obtained.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. J. C. Rudd, D. D., Benjamin Hale, D. D., William Shelton, D. D., John Henry Hobart. Messrs. James Rees, W. C. Pierrepont, T. D. Burrall, David Hudson.

Deputies to the General Convention. Rev. Messrs. P. A. Proal, D. D., H. Gregory, D. D., Edward Ingersoll, J. V. Van Ingen, D. D. Messrs. W. C. Pierrepont, Horatio Seymour, George B. Webster, C. H. Carroll.

EDUCATIONAL.

Kenyon College. Ohio. The Commencement Exercises were held in Rosse Chapel, on Wednesday, the 2d day of August. The degree of A. B. was conferred on the following young gentlemen, who have completed the College course:—J. D. Ebersole, A. B. Gray, J. Lindly, W. J. Scott, Martin Andrews, J. W. F. Foster Wm. G. LeDuc, S. J. Patrick, W. K. Rogers, C. S. Doolittle, and D. Turpie.

The degree of A. M. was conferred in course on H. N. Bishop, Jacob A. Camp, C. H. Cooley, T. S. Goodwin, John A. Little, L. W. Pettibone, Joseph Muenschner, and the honorary degree of A. M. on E. H. Davis, M. D.

Trinity College, (Ct.) Commencement. The Commencement of this University was held on Thursday, Aug. 4th. President Totten having resigned the Presidency of the College, a vote was passed by the Corporation, requesting him to sit for his portrait, to be placed in the Library with those of the former Presidents and benefactors of the College. When the resignation became known in Convocation, votes were passed expressive of respect; and a communication of similar import was addressed to him by those members who had been graduated during his incumbency. The Rev. John Williams, D. D., of Schenectady, was then unanimously chosen President. The commencement exercises were of a high character. The Degree of A. B. was conferred upon all the members of the graduating class—fourteen in all.

The degree of A. M. was conferred in course upon the following members of Trinity College, being Bachelors of Arts of at least three years standing:

Lewis Fenn Wadsworth, Samuel J. Clark, John A. Paddock, Alexander Capron, Noble Palmer, Pearl S. Cossitt, Sam'l Flower, William F. Taylor, and Mr. James Rankine of Union College. Rev. Wm. White Bronson, A. M.,

of University of Pennsylvania; Rev. Peter S. Chauncey, A. M., of Columbia College; Rev. Samuel Fuller, A. M., of Union College; Rev. Thomas C. Pitkin, A. M., of Yale College; Rev. Henry W. Adams, A. M., of Wesleyan University, were admitted *ad eundem gradum*. The honorary degree of A. M. was conferred on the Rev. Samuel Chase, and on John A. Merrick, Esq.

The Honorary Degree of D. D. was conferred on the Rt. Rev. David Low, Bishop of Ross and Moray, (Scotland;) on the Rt. Rev. Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyle and the Isles, (Scotland;) and on the Rev. Thomas Atkinson, Rector of St. Peter's, Baltimore.

Geneva College. The Commencement of this Institution was held August 2d. The degree of A. B. was conferred upon the following members of the graduating class:

Oliver Whitney Belden, Rochester; Edwy Noble Cruttenden, Oxford; James Hiram Fisher, Buffalo; John Clark Gear, Galena, Ill.; Benjamin Hale, Jr., Geneva; William Henry Hyde, Oxford; Augustus Mortimer Leach, Lyons; Carlton Peters Maples, Pike; Robert Parke, Geneva; Clarence Armstrong Seward, Auburn; Theodore Sterling, Geneva; Lawrence Sterne Stevens, Camden; Francis Granger Young, Geneva; Albert Wood, Camden.

The degree of M. A. in course, was conferred upon Calvin Huson, Jr., William Talmage McDonald, and William Edwards Woodruff.

The honorary degree of M. A. upon the Rev. Orlando Fales Starkey, Rev. Timothy F. Wardwell, Rev. Wm. H. Goodwin, and Wm. H. Bogart, Esq.

The degree of D. D. was conferred upon the Rt. Rev. David Low, Bishop of Ross and Moray, (Scotland,) the Rev. Smyth Pyne, Washington, D. C., the Rev. Sherlock A. Bronson, President of Kenyon College, and the Rev. James A. Bolles, Batavia.

During the past year, the Vestry of Trinity Church in New York, has endowed this College with an annuity of \$6000, from May 1, 1866: the Hobart Professorship fund has made considerable progress towards completion, with the prospect of its being speedily filled up; and the State has relieved its present necessities by a grant of \$3000 for two years.

General Theological Seminary. The examination of the students in this Institution commenced on Monday, June 26th, and was continued Tuesday and Wednesday—conducted by Professors Turner, Wilson, Moore, Ogilby, and Haight, in their respective departments, in the presence of a Committee of the Board of Trustees, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut, the Rev. Messrs. Atkinson, of Maryland, Watson, of Connecticut, Williams of New Jersey, and Odenheimer, of Pennsylvania. The examination was thorough, and the students generally acquitted themselves creditably. The Commencement was celebrated on Friday. After Morning Prayer and an earnest and impressive Charge from Bishop DeLancey, the following gentlemen received the Diploma of the Seminary:

R. Ralston Cox, A. M., Pennsylvania; T. Stafford Drowne, A. B., New York; Theodore A. Eaton, New York; James F. LeBaron, New York; Andrew Mackie, Jr., A. B., New Jersey; Josiah Phelps, Indiana; Sylvanus Reed, Western New York; Horace Hall Reid, A. M., New York; Robert C. Rogers, A. B., Connecticut; Rufus D. Stearns, A. B., Western New York.

OBITUARIES.

Died on Sunday, July 9th, at 10 o'clock, P. M., the Rev. SAMUEL SEYMORE LEWIS, D. D., for eleven years Rector of Christ Church in Mobile. Endowed by nature with a good mind, he had spared no pains to cultivate and develop its powers. Improving diligently his opportunities at Trinity College—at which he was graduated—and at the General Seminary of the Church, he entered the minis-

try with a warm heart—and well stored mind, unreservedly consecrated to its holy duties.

His first charge was Christ Church, Tuscaloosa. After a useful ministry of nearly three years, he removed to Mobile, and became assistant minister of Christ Church. Soon after, the Rector resigning, he was chosen to succeed him, and entered upon the duties of his office. The prospects of the Church in Mobile were then, for peculiar reasons, very discouraging. Dr. L. felt the difficulty of his position, and set himself to accomplish all that man might as God's instrument. He gave himself wholly to the work, and very soon his profiting began to appear unto all.

He found a congregation not numbering over one hundred persons, worshipping in a small frame building; he left one of the largest in the southern country, worshipping in a commodious Church, which is an ornament to the city. He found a little band of ten or fifteen faithful communicants; in five years the number reached two hundred, and very soon his people acquired a reputation for good works and general benevolence, which extends through the length and breadth of the land.

For many years previous to his death, Dr. L. had been a sufferer from a disease, whose consuming power is rarely staid. Long did he continue to do full duty, when a less devoted spirit than he would have thought it impossible to ascend the pulpit. But about two years ago, with a sad heart, he relinquished his Parish, and journeyed north, to seek relaxation and medical advice. Finding all efforts to restore his health unavailing, he returned to Mobile last winter, as he said, to die among his people, and lay his mortal remains beneath the chancel of his beloved Church.

For three months he was entirely confined to his bed or chair, and exhibited, without the slightest intermission, the meekness and humble submission of the most perfect Christian. He often said his only desire was, that God would keep him here till he was prepared for heaven. As his end approached, his faith grew stronger, and his views of religious truth clearer. A cloud seemed never to interpose between him and the Sun of righteousness, but he appeared always assured that He in whom he had trusted in life, would be his rod and staff through the dark valley, and his portion in the eternal world. Indeed, death was to him completely disarmed of its terrors. He regarded it as the messenger by whom he was to be called home.

At New Milford, on the 2d of August, Rev. CYRUS MONSON, Rector of St. John's Church in that place. We have received no particulars of his life and death, which we hope to do for the next number.

At Westville (New Haven) on the 5th inst., Mr John H. JACOBS, aged 70. His remains were brought to New Haven for interment, and the funeral solemnities performed in Trinity Church, and at the place of burial, attended by a large circle of descendants, relatives and friends.

Mr Jacobs was a native of North Carolina, having descended from one of the oldest and most respectable families of that State. But having received his education in Yale College, he formed an early attachment, and settled in New Haven, and soon became identified with the religious and political concerns of Connecticut, still however, retaining an unabated love for his native State. He was for many years, actively engaged in mercantile pursuits; and although he shared in the pecuniary misfortunes of trade at that period, his character for strict integrity was always maintained and acknowledged. He took a zealous and active part in the political movements of his day, and his contributions, under the signature of 'Toleration,' led to the organization of the "Toleration party," which gained a triumphant ascendancy, and produced a good and permanent change in the civil and religious aspects and relations of the State.

He died as for many years he had lived, in communion with the Church; and the participation of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, was among the last acts of his life. His end was peaceful and tranquil, and full of consolation to his numerous friends.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

IRISH CHURCH.

CONSECRATION. The Rev. James Wilson, D. D., was recently consecrated Bishop of the united Diocese of Cork, Cloyne and Ross, vacated by the death of the late incumbent, Bishop Kyle. The services were held in the Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin; and the officiating Prelates were the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Heath, and the Bishop of Ossory, Leighlin, and Ferns. The Sermon was by Rev. C. R. Elrington, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.

ENGLISH CHURCH.

ORDINATIONS. The following is a summary of the Trinity Sunday Ordinations: Canterbury, Deacons 11, Priests 6; York, Deacons 13, Priests 13; London, Deacons 19, Priests 9; Bath and Wells, Deacons 6, Priests 6; Chichester, Deacons 5, Priests 8; Ely, Deacons 5, Priests 12; Exeter, Deacons 13, Priests 17; Gloucester and Bristol, Deacons 4, Priests 9; Hereford, Deacons 6, Priests 8; Lichfield, Deacons 26, Priests 21; Lincoln, Deacons 3, Priests 3; Manchester, Deacons 11, Priests 11; Oxford, Deacons 19, Priests 18; Peterborough, Deacons 6, Priests 11; Ripon, Deacons 13, Priests 6; Rochester, Deacons 8, Priests 11; St. David's, Deacons 6, Priests 2; Worcester, Deacons 25, Priests 15: total, Deacons 199, Priests 185. Of these were of Cambridge, Deacons 86, Priests 76; of Oxford, Deacons 60, Priests 84; of Durham, Deacons 7, Priests 2; of London, Deacons 5; of St. Bees, Deacons 17, Priests 8; of Lampeter, Deacons 3; of Dublin, Deacons 10, Priests 10; of the Church Missionary College, Islington, Deacons 2; literate persons, Deacons 9, Priests 5.

ST. AUGUSTIN'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY.

This Missionary College grew out of the fact, that all attempts to engraft a Missionary scheme upon the ecclesiastical polity have failed, that the Schools and Colleges in England are inadequate to supply the existing want of Clergy at home; besides the Universities at Oxford and Cambridge are too expensive, and are adapted too exclusively to other objects, to answer the purpose of training up Missionaries for the extensive Colonies of England and the heathen world. Private munificence has at last effected what has been so long and hopelessly demanded.

The Archbishops and Bishops of the English Church have given their sanction to the foundation of this College. The site pitched upon is remarkable, being in the metropolitical city of Canterbury, and on the site of the old *Priory* of St. Augustine. This site for the monastery is said to have been assigned to Augustine by Ethelbert, King of Kent, in A. D. 605, which was dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul the Apostles, and was under the Benedictine rule. The revenues of this Monastery were once great; its territory in lands in the reign of Richard II, being 11,682 acres; and at its suppression by Henry VIII, in A. D. 1539, its revenues exceeded £1,400. Henry, Edward VI, Elizabeth, and Charles I, had royal apartments within the walls, and the desecration finally was such, that it was occupied as a common tavern and appropriated to all kinds of unhallowed uses, so that the profane song and the oath of the drunkard were heard in what was once the house of prayer.

The front of the Monastic building, which also forms the front of the Missionary College, looks westward, and is about 250 feet in length; at either

end of which were two striking gateways, both still remaining. The northern is said to have been built in A. D. 1287, and is in the richest and best style of the period. The new college is built in the style of the 14th century, and harmonizes admirably with the fine old gateway which has been incorporated with it, and now forms the grand entrance. The walls all round are faced with square flint and rag stone, which, contrasted with the red tiled roofing and the quaint Gothic forms of the stone-masonry where it intervenes, has a singular but very pleasing effect. The library has a fine pitched roof, and is lighted on each side by six windows, and at the end by a large one with stained glass. Some progress has already been made in the collection of books; the bulk of Bishop Horne's library, with other similar benefactions, has been bestowed upon the institution.

The Constitution of the College is that of a Warden and Fellows, to be under the appointment of the two Archbishops and some of the Bishops. Bishop Coleridge, formerly Diocesan of Barbadoes, has been appointed first Warden, Mr. Pearson has been nominated sub-Warden, and one of the vacant Fellowships has been bestowed upon Mr. Moore. The college will receive its first students in about two months, and has present accommodations for about fifty, the annual expense to each not exceeding £35, or about \$160.

The consecration of the new college of St. Augustine took place on Thursday afternoon, June 29th. There were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, Earl Powis, Earl Nelson, the Earl of Marsh, Mr. Justice Coleridge, Mr. Justice Patteson, Mr. Baron Alderson, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Fredericton, the Bishop of Brechin, (Scotland,) Bishop Coleridge, and upwards of one thousand Clergymen. The service in the Cathedral commenced at twelve o'clock. The sermon was preached by his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, from Eph. iii, 10. At the close of the Cathedral Service, the College was inspected by the company, and a luncheon was provided for the guests. The company separated shortly before 6 o'clock.

The individual, whose munificence has thus given a new aspect to the hopes of the Church, is Mr. Beresford Hope, M. P., for Maidstone, who purchased the site and buildings of the old monastery and abbey, in 1844, and has erected the new structure, at a cost of from £30,000 to £40,000. The Institution has now received the authority and sanction of the whole Church, and will, we trust, fulfill a lofty mission of usefulness.

May God put it into the hearts of some of those in the American Church, to whom He has given immense wealth, to plant and endow Missionary Colleges in our own land.

ENGLISH CHURCH MISSIONS.

We herewith present a tolerably complete abstract of the doings of the two great Missionary Societies of the English Church, together with the organization of said Societies. Hereafter we shall give more minute details of the condition of the Missions in the various fields, many of which are full of promise. The following Abstracts have been arranged with great care from the Annual Reports of the Societies, and may be relied upon as authentic.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

We have before us, the Report of the above Venerable Society, for the year 1847, as also the sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, at the one hundred and forty-sixth Anniversary Meeting of said Society, by the Rt. Rev. Henry, Lord Bishop of Worcester. From this Report, we glean the following facts respecting said Society, and its present condition and operations.

The Society was "Incorporated by Royal Charter in the year 1701, for

the receiving, managing, and disposing of such funds as might be contributed for the religious instruction of her Majesty's subjects beyond the seas ; for the maintenance of Clergymen in the Plantations, Colonies, and Factories of Great Britain ; and for the propagation of the Gospel in those parts."

Of this Society, there are twelve "members by charter," viz: The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Archbishop of York, the Lord Bishop of London, the Lord Bishop of Ely, the Lord Almoner, the Dean of Westminster, the Dean of St. Paul's, the Archdeacon of London, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, the Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford, and the Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. The Officers of the Society are as follows:

PRESIDENT. The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

VICE PRESIDENTS. The Most Reverend the Archbishop, and the Right Reverends the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland ; the Right Reverends the Colonial Bishops, and twenty-four others, Clergymen and laymen.

STANDING COMMITTEE. The President, the Vice Presidents, the Treasurers, the Secretary, and nineteen others, Clergymen and laymen.

Also five Auditors, two Treasurers, a Consulting Physician, a Secretary, (Rev. Ernest Hawkins, B. D.,) and two Assistant Secretaries, a Treasurer's Clerk, and a Collector.

The following SUMMARY, carefully compiled, gives the present operations of the Society, with the several stations, and the amount of strength exerted in each at the date of the Report.

DIOCESE OF NOVA SCOTIA, comprising the Colonies of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, and Prince Edward's Island, with 46 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF FREDERICTON, comprising New Brunswick, with 36 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF QUEBEC, comprising Canada East, with 51 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF TORONTO, comprising Canada West, with 91 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF NEWFOUNDLAND, comprising Newfoundland and the Bermudas, with 28 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF JAMAICA, comprising Jamaica and the Bahamas, with 12 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF BARBADOES, with 12 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF ANTIGUA, with 4 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF GULANA, with 9 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF CALCUTTA, comprising Bengal, with 16 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF MADRAS, comprising Madras, with 21 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF BOMBAY, comprising Bombay, with 3 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF COLOMBO, comprising Ceylon, with 6 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF CAPE TOWN, comprising Cape of Good Hope and St. Helena, with 6 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF SYDNEY, comprising part of New South Wales, with 24 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF NEW CASTLE, comprising part of New South Wales, with 6 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF MELBOURNE, comprising part of New South Wales, with 4 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF ADELAIDE, comprising South Australia and Western Australia, with 9 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF NEW ZEALAND, comprising New Zealand, with 3 Missionaries.

DIOCESE OF TASMANIA, comprising Van Diemen's Land and Seychelles, with 8 Missionaries.

In all, the operations of the Society are exerted in *twenty* Missionary Dioceses, with THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE Missionaries. Each Diocese is under the supervision and government of its own Missionary Bishop. In addition to the above list of Clergy, the number of Divinity Students, Catechists, and Schoolmasters, maintained by the Society, is above THREE HUNDRED.

The total amount collected up to the first of September, was in donations, £15,000, and in subscriptions nearly £1,000 per annum for five years.

The most important event during the year preceding the date of the Report was the erection of four additional Bishoprics, for the more efficient administration of the Church in these remote Provinces of the British Empire. Three of the new Sees will be planted in different divisions of the great Australian Continent; and the fourth in the long-neglected colony of the Cape of Good Hope. The Report says, "the same year has furnished another instance of singular liberality towards the Colonial Church; and the Society can not refrain from offering this public tribute of gratitude to Miss Burdett Coutts for the great and lasting benefit she has conferred upon the Church of CHRIST, by endowing forever two Bishoprics."

The Annual Report contains a mass of information on the state of the Missions in the various Dioceses, much of which is of the most cheering character. We may hereafter make extracts from the statements of the Missionaries themselves. For the present, we append a few statements concerning a portion of the Diocese of Madras, under the care of the Rt. Rev. George Trevor Spencer, D. D. The Bishop says, "The extension of sound Christian education is one of the most interesting and important features of the Society's present Missionary operations. In one small mission district, (that of Edeyenkoody,) 507 native Christian children in an equal proportion of both sexes (253 boys and 254 girls) are under daily instruction in the mission schools; and that in a single Christian village of another mission district (Mordaloor) there is an average daily attendance of 236 boys and girls."

"We must not forget to mention, *five preparandi* classes, *four* boarding schools for boys, and *eight* for girls, in the Tanjore, Trichinopoly, and Tinnevely districts; in several of which it is designed to give a superior as well as Tamil education."

"But of all the measures which, in dependence on the Divine Head of the Church, have been adopted, the establishment of the two Seminaries of Sawyerpooram, in the Tinnevely, and of Vedarpooram in the Tanjore districts, appears to us incalculably the most important. They are designed for the superior education of a comparatively limited number of the most promising native Christian youths from the various Missions, in the anxious hope that from them an efficient native ministry may be ultimately raised up, and that, at least, a large proportion of the students may be found qualified to fill some office in connection with the Church, as superior Catechists or Schoolmasters."

This the Bishop says, has long appeared to him the only Scriptural and practicable plan (that is, *by an efficient native ministry*) to convey the glad tidings of SALVATION, to the millions of Southern India lying in darkness and the shadow of death. The Seminary at Sawyerpooram, is intended for boarding and educating 100 youths in the junior, and 24 scholars in the senior department. The Seminary at Vedarpooram, is at present arranged for 48 students, all of whom are boarders, with lecture rooms, library, and residences for the masters. His lordship also states that within the last three years, there have been built in one single district of the Tinnevely Mission, four large and seven smaller Churches, with accommodations for 2,940

worshippers, also four central and ten village schools to hold 680 boys and girls.

One of his Lordships Missionaries, Rev. R. Caldwell, gives a most encouraging account of his Mission. We have room only for the following brief extracts: "Within ten miles of my residence, there are upwards of thirty villages and hamlets into which Christianity has been introduced, and in each of which, a congregation or the germ of one has been established." "The proportion of the inhabitants of Tinnevely who have embraced Christianity, is larger than that of any other province in India. In many places entire villages have renounced their idols, and the movement in favor of Christianity is extending from village to village, and from caste to caste. In every district in the Province, Churches, and Schools, and Missionary houses, and model villages are rising apace, testimonies of the Church's Faith in expecting to possess the entire field."

The Reports of Missionaries from other portions of the vast Missionary field are scarcely less promising, and show a degree of system and efficiency, and an amount of self-denial and devotedness which are worthy of the brightest days of the Church, and are, we doubt not, the earnest of greater and better things to come, when Zion shall arise, her light being come, and the glory of God having risen upon her.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The following account of the "Church Missionary Society" is taken from the "Forty Seventh Report" of the Committee, presented at the Annual Meeting, held in Exeter Hall, Strand, on Tuesday, May 4th, 1847.

From the Laws and Regulations of the Society, which accompany the Report, we learn the following, respecting its organization:—"This Institution shall be designated 'The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East,' and shall be conducted by a Patron, or Patrons, a Vice Patron, a President, Vice Presidents, a Committee, and such officers as may be deemed necessary, all being Members of the Established Church. The office of PATRON is reserved for such members of the Royal family as may honor it with their protection, and the office of VICE PATRON for His Grace, the Primate of all Edgland; if being member of the Society, he shall accept the office. The PRESIDENT shall be such Temporal Peer, or Commoner, as may be appointed to that office; and VICE PRESIDENTS shall consist of all Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, who, being Members of the Society, shall accept the office, and of such Temporal Peers and Commoners, as, being also Members, shall be appointed thereto."

The Committee consists of twenty-four Lay Members of the Established Church, and of all such Clergymen as are Members of the Society. This Committee elect, at its Annual Meeting, either from themselves, or other Members of the Society, a *Committee of Patronage*, a *Committee of Funds*, a *Committee of Correspondence*, and a *Committee of Accounts*, each to keep minutes of its proceedings, and to report to the General Committee.

The following Extracts from the Appendix to the Thirty-ninth Report of the Society, in 1839, will show the degree of harmony between the Constitution and practice of the Society, and the Ecclesiastical principles of the Church of England. The Appendix states that the "Society is strictly a *Lay* Institution, and exercises, as a Society, no *spiritual* functions whatsoever. It states that the office of the Society, is I. *The collection of the Home Revenue and the disbursement of it abroad.* II. *The Selecting and Educating Candidates for Missionary employment.* III. *The sending forth, to particular stations, the Missionaries thus ordained, (by the Bishop of London,) or other Clergymen who have been previously ordained.* IV. *The Su-*

perintendence of Missionaries in their labors among the Heathen, (in stations extra-Diocesan, if within the jurisdiction of a Colonial Bishop they are under his superintendence.) The Appendix also vouches for the "mutual confidence and good understanding existing between the Committee of the Society, and the Ecclesiastical Authorities of every Colonial Diocese in which Missionaries are laboring," and declares that nothing less than the sanction of a duly assembled *Convocation*, can more duly identify the acts of any Missionary Society with the Church.

Such are the organization and principles of the "Church Missionary Society." At the date of the Report the office of *Patron* is vacant. The Archbishop of Canterbury is Vice Patron. The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Chichester is President. There are sixty-one Vice Presidents, among whom are most of the Bishops of the United Church. The Secretaries are Rev. Henry Venn, B. D., Rev. Henry Davies, M. A., and Major Hector Straith. There is also a long list of *Honorary* Governors for Life, Life Governors, and Annual Governors.

The amount of Funds collected during the preceding year is £116,827. 18s. 11d., or about *five hundred and twenty thousand dollars*, and is the largest annual income ever received by the Society.

During the year, three Clergymen and one European School-master have been removed by death; and twelve Clergymen have left their stations, chiefly on account of ill health.

The following abstract shows the present operations of the Society in its several Missionary fields:—

WEST AFRICA MISSION. Commenced 1804. Fourteen European Missionaries; one Country born Missionary; four European Catechists; one European female Teacher; forty Native Catechists and Teachers; one Country born Schoolmistress; nine Native Schoolmistresses; thirteen Stations; one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six Communicants; six thousand nine hundred and twenty-one Attendants on Public Worship; two Seminaries; forty-five Students; fifty-nine schools; five thousand five hundred and sixty-nine Scholars.

ABBEOKOUTA MISSION. Commenced 1845. Two European Missionaries; one Native Missionary; three Native Teachers; two Stations; eighteen Communicants; sixty Attendants on Public Worship; two Schools; sixty three Scholars.

MEDITERRANEAN MISSION—in three Stations—Syra, in Greece, commenced 1828; Smyrna, in Asia Minor, commenced 1830; and Cairo, in Egypt, commenced 1826. Syra has one European Missionary; one European Schoolmaster; six Native Schoolmasters; four Native Schoolmistresses; six Schools; four hundred and eighty-two Scholars. Smyrna has one European Missionary; one European Lay Assistant; one Native Assistant. Cairo has two European Missionaries; one European Teacher; five Native Teachers; three Native female Teachers; twenty-four Communicants, (including Europeans;) one Seminary, (Coptic;) ten Students; two Schools; three hundred and three Scholars.

EAST AFRICA MISSION. Commenced 1843. Two European Missionaries.

BOMBAY AND WESTERN INDIA MISSION. Commenced 1820. Five European Missionaries; two Europeans, Catechist and Teacher; one East Indian Catechist; twenty-four Native Teachers; four Stations; twenty-seven Communicants; eighteen Schools; eight hundred and ninety Scholars.

CALCUTTA AND NORTH INDIA MISSION. Commenced 1816. Twenty-five European Missionaries; one East Indian Missionary; four European Catechists and Teachers; one European female Teacher; five East Indian Catechists and Teachers; one hundred and two Native Catechists and Teachers; eleven Native Schoolmistresses; eighteen Stations; eight hundred and

fourteen Communicants; three thousand and ten attendants on Public Worship; fifty-nine Seminaries and Schools; three thousand five hundred and thirteen Seminarists and Scholars.

HIMALAYA MISSION. Commenced 1844. Two European Missionaries; two Native Teachers; five Schools; forty-nine Scholars; (returns of Scholars incomplete.)

MADRAS AND SOUTH INDIA MISSION. Commenced 1814. Twenty-six European Missionaries; two East Indian Missionaries; two Native Missionaries; one European Teacher; one European Printer; two European female Teachers; eight East Indian Catechists and Teachers; one hundred and twenty-five Native Catechists; three hundred and sixty-five Native Teachers; fifty-four Native Schoolmistresses; one East Indian female Teacher; eighteen Stations; three thousand two hundred and sixty-three Communicants; two hundred and ninety-three Seminaries and Schools; eight thousand and fifty-one Seminarists and Scholars.

CEYLON MISSION. Commenced 1818. Ten European Missionaries; three Native Missionaries; one European Catechist; twenty-two Native Catechists; eighty-eight Native Teachers; twenty-one Native Schoolmistresses; five Stations; three hundred and twenty-two Communicants; three thousand four hundred and sixty-three attendants on Public Worship; four Seminaries; seventy Seminarists; seventy-two Schools; two thousand four hundred and sixty-five Scholars.

CHINA MISSION. Commenced 1844. One European Missionary.

NEW ZEALAND MISSION. Commenced 1815. Sixteen European Missionaries; twelve European Catechists and Teachers; one European Printer; three female European Teachers; three hundred and fourteen Native Catechists and Teachers; forty-nine Native female Teachers; twenty-four Stations; four thousand four hundred and fifty-four Communicants; (other returns defective.)

WEST INDIA MISSION. The only Stations still occupied in the West Indies, are at British Guiana and Jamaica. British Guiana commenced 1827. Two European Missionaries; one European female Teacher; one Country born Teacher; one hundred Communicants; two hundred and sixty attendants on Public Worship; three Schools; eighty-four Scholars.—Jamaica commenced 1826. One European Missionary; one Country born Catechist; two Stations; five hundred and forty-two Communicants; one thousand two hundred and fifty attendants on Public Worship; five Schools; six hundred and thirty-eight Scholars.

NORTH WEST AMERICA MISSION. Commenced 1822. Four European Missionaries; four European Schoolmasters; two Country born Teachers; two Native Teachers; six Stations; five hundred and thirty Communicants; one thousand eight hundred attendants on Public Worship; nine Schools; five hundred and ninety-four Scholars.

GENERAL SUMMARY. *One hundred Stations; one hundred and fourteen European Ordained Missionaries; four East Indian and Country born Ordained Missionaries; six Native Ordained Missionaries; thirty-three European Catechists, Schoolmasters and other Laymen; eight female European Teachers; nineteen East Indian and Country born Catechists and other Teachers; one thousand and ninety-six Native Catechists and other Teachers; three East Indian and Country born Schoolmistresses; one hundred and fifty-two Native Schoolmistresses; eleven thousand nine hundred and seventy Communicants.*

CANADA WEST.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto held an Ordination in Hamilton, on Sunday, July 30th, at which time ten gentlemen were admitted to the Holy Order of

Deacons, and five to that of Priests. Seven of the Deacons and four of the Priests are to be engaged in missionary labors in the Diocese. Eight of the Deacons were from the Diocesan Theological College at Cobourg, in which there were lately seventeen students. In the evening service following the Ordination, seventy-five persons received the Rite of Confirmation. On the next day, a deputation from the congregation at Hamilton, waited upon the Bishop with an Address, to which he made an appropriate and beautiful reply. The Church in this large Diocese seems to be infused with fresh life; though, as we judge, it had never to contend with fiercer opposition.

APOSTACY TO ROME.

Two Clergymen of the English Church, of the Diocese of Sydney, New South Wales, have recently joined the Church of Rome. Their Diocesan, Bp. Broughton, says that their only plea for the step, was "their conviction of the necessity of being in communion with what one of them terms the See of St. Peter, and the other the Holy See." Both of them appear to have acted with great precipitancy; both of them fed from the breasts of their Spiritual Mother, up to the very moment of the matricidal act; and both were guilty of entire want of candor towards their Spiritual and Canonical Head. So little are the principles of Catholic Order understood or appreciated, and so bold is the arrogance of Papal pretension, that apostacy occasions more regret than surprise.

POPERY IN ENGLAND.

The most extraordinary exertions are now being made to establish Romanism in England, by building Churches and planting religious establishments, male and female; at the head of which operations, we see the names of Bp. Wiseman, Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer, Dr. Newman, Mr. Oakley and Dr. Whitty. The demands of the Romanists upon Parliament for Governmental support are more and more exacting. The torpid body which has been so tenderly embraced, seems warming into activity.

ENGLISH COLONIAL BISHOPRICS' FUND.

All the six Bishoprics which were named, as requiring immediate erection, in the First Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops, dated Whit-Tuesday, 1841, have now been endowed.

Of the seven remaining Sees, to the future erection of which that Declaration had regard, three have also been established, in British Guiana, South Australia, and Port Philip.

There remain four of this latter division still to be formed, viz: at Sierra Leone, and Western Australia, as well as for Northern India, (Agra,) and Southern India, (Tanjore and Tinnevely.) Since that time, the plan of founding a Bishopric for the British possessions in the Chinese seas has been sanctioned in the third Report of the Episcopal Committee, dated May 18, 1846; and the Mauritius and Prince Rupert's Land (the Hudson Bay Company's territories) have also been named, as appearing to require resident Bishops of their own.

The Bishoprics, therefore, still to be formed in the British possessions abroad, may be mentioned in the following order: Sierra Leone, (for the care of the flourishing and important missions of the Church Missionary Society,) Western Australia, Agra, Tanjore and Tinnevely, China, the Mauritius and Prince Rupert's land.

It is to be hoped that the year 1848 will, at least witness the consecration of an English Missionary Bishop for China.